

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
Eduardo Garcia (State Bar #290572)
3990 Old Town Avenue, Suite C204
San Diego, CA 92110
Telephone: (619) 599-8292
Facsimile: (619) 599-8291
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
egarcia@jcl-lawfirm.com

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
3990 Old Town Avenue, Suite C204
San Diego, CA 92110
Telephone: (619) 255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
shani@zakaylaw.com
jackland@zakaylaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SOLANO

JACQUELINE NAYYAR, an individual,
AMANDA MEDRANO, an individual, on
behalf of themselves and on behalf of all
persons similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PIZZA INVESTMENT ENTREPRENEURS,
L.L.C., a Nevada limited liability company;
and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

ASSIGNED TO
JUDGE Wendy G. Getty
FOR ALL PURPOSES

FILED/ENDORSED
Clerk of the Superior Court

JUL 14 2021

By R. PULIDO
DEPUTY CLERK

Case No:

FCS 056004

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1) UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §17200 *et seq*;
- 2) FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1;
- 3) FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 510, *et seq*;
- 4) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
- 5) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
- 6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§226 and 226.2;

VIA FAX

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

7) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES
FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION
OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
8) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN
DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§
201, 202 AND 203;
9) UNLAWFUL DEDUCTIONS;
10) VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT [LABOR
CODE §§ 2698 *et seq.*]

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff Jaqueline Nayyar, an individual, and Amanda Medrano, an individual,
2 (“PLAINTIFFS” or “PLAINTIFF”), on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated current
3 and former employees, allege on information and belief, except for their own acts and knowledge
4 which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

5 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

6 1. Defendant PIZZA INVESTMENT ENTREPRENEURS, L.L.C.
7 (“DEFENDANT” and/or “DEFENDANTS”) is a Limited Liability Company and at all relevant
8 times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business
9 throughout California.

10 2. DEFENDANT operates Pieology Pizzeria locations, including locations
11 throughout the State of California, including the Solano County, California location where
12 PLAINTIFF worked.

13 3. PLAINTIFF Nayyar was employed by DEFENDANT in California as a non-
14 exempt employee entitled to minimum wages, overtime pay and meal and rest periods from
15 December 2017 to July 2020.

16 4. PLAINTIFF Medrano was employed by DEFENDANT in California as a non-
17 exempt employee entitled to minimum wages, overtime pay and meal and rest periods from March
18 2018 to January 2021.

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

26 6. PLAINTIFFS bring this Class Action on behalf of themselves and a
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses
28 incurred during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANT’S uniform policy

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

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

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

25 **THE CONDUCT**

26 9. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
27 required to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,
28 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including

1 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time, DEFENDANT
2 required PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without paying them for all
3 the time they were under DEFENDANT’S control. Specifically, PLAINTIFFS performed work
4 before and after the beginning of her shift, spending time under the DEFENDANTS’ control for
5 which she was not compensated. As a result, the PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
6 Members forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their
7 time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and
8 overtime rates. DEFENDANTS’ uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFFS and other
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANTS’ business
10 records.

11 10. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFFS and other
12 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also from time to time unable to take off duty meal breaks
13 and were not fully relieved of duty for meal periods. Specifically, PLAINTIFFS and
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time interrupted during their off-duty meal
15 breaks to complete tasks for DEFENDANTS. PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
16 Members were required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5)
17 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to
18 provide PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period
19 each workday in which these employees were required by DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours
20 of work. DEFENDANTS’ policy caused PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
21 Members to remain on-call and on-duty during what was supposed to be their off-duty meal
22 periods. PLAINTIFFS and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members therefore forfeited meal
23 breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS’ strict corporate
24 policy and practice.

25 11. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, from time to time, PLAINTIFFS and
26 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours
27 without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their
28 first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4)

1 hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between
2 six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for
3 some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more. When they did have an opportunity to take their
4 rest breaks, PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were often interrupted and
5 required by DEFENDANTS to work during their rest breaks. When they did have an opportunity
6 to take their rest breaks, PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to
7 remain on the premises, on-duty and on-call, and subject to DEFENDANTS' control in
8 accordance with DEFENDANTS' policy. PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
9 Members were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. DEFENDANTS' policy
10 caused PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to remain on the premises, on-
11 call and on-duty during what was supposed to be their off-duty rest periods. As a result of their
12 rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were
13 periodically denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers.

14 12. Under California law, every employer shall pay to each employee, on the
15 established payday for the period involved, not less than the applicable minimum wage for all
16 hours worked in the payroll period, whether the remuneration is measured by time, piece,
17 commission, or otherwise. Hours worked is defined in the applicable Wage Order as "the time
18 during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the
19 employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so." PLAINTIFFS and
20 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time required to perform work for
21 DEFENDANTS before and after their scheduled shifts, as well as during their off-duty meal
22 breaks. DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
23 Members for any of the time spent under DEFENDANTS' control while working off-the-clock.
24 As such, DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
25 the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in a payroll period.

26 13. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
27 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANTS as a
28 matter of company policy, practice and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to

1 compensate PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time
2 worked. This uniform policy and practice of DEFENDANTS is intended to purposefully avoid
3 the payment of the correct compensation as required by California law which allowed
4 DEFENDANTS to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who complied
5 with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS
6 against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

7 14. From time to time, when PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
8 Members worked during what was supposed to be their meal breaks or otherwise off the clock,
9 DEFENDANTS also failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
10 CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things,
11 the correct time worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday
12 and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek, and the gross wages paid for those periods during the
13 pay period, and the correct penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods in violation of
14 California Labor Code Sections 226 and 226.2.

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

23 16. Aside from the violations listed herein, DEFENDANTS failed to issue to
24 PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor
25 Code 226 *et seq.* From time to time DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section
26 226(a)(2) by failing to provide an accurate amount of total hours worked by PLAINTIFFS and
27 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Specifically, DEFENDANTS included items,
28 including but not limited to "Sick" to the total hours worked. However, the foregoing item is not

1 considered total hours worked for purposes of California Labor Code Section 226(a)(2). Further,
2 DEFENDANTS from time to time failed to issue an itemized wage statement to PLAINTIFFS
3 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that included the total hours worked and/or the
4 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
5 worked at each hourly rate by PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.
6 As a result, from time to time DEFENDANTS provided PLAINTIFFS and the other members of
7 the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

19 18. In the course of their employment, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
20 Members as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANTS to use their own personal
21 cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for
22 DEFENDANTS but were not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANTS for the cost
23 associated with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANTS' benefit. Specifically,
24 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANTS to
25 use their personal cell phones for work related issues. As a result, in the course of their
26 employment with DEFENDANTS the PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA
27 CLASS incurred unreimbursed business expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs
28

1 related to the use of their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of
2 DEFENDANTS.

3 19. Further, DEFENDANT unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFFS and
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' pay for 401(k) retirement plans without authorization to do so
5 or notice to PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. As a result, DEFENDANT
6 violated Labor Code § 221.

7 20. PLAINTIFFS further alleges that the station counters in DEFENDANT's stores
8 provide ample space behind each counter area to allow for the presence and use of a stool or seat
9 by DEFENDANT's employees' during the performance of their work duties. DEFENDANT's
10 employees' working at DEFENDANT's stores spend a very substantial portion, and, in many
11 workdays, the vast majority of their working time behind these counters. The nature of the position
12 can reasonably be accomplished while using a seat/stool.

13 21. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
14 requirements of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order,
15 DEFENDANT as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, intentionally, knowingly
16 and systematically failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and the other Aggrieved Employees suitable
17 seating when the nature of these employees' work reasonably permitted sitting.

18 22. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFFS and other
19 Aggrieved Employees were entitled to suitable seating and/or were entitled to sit when it did not
20 interfere with the performance of their duties, and that DEFENDANT did not provide suitable
21 seating and/or did not allow them to sit when it did not interfere with the performance of their
22 duties. By reason of this conduct applicable to PLAINTIFFS and all Aggrieved Employees,
23 DEFENDANT violated California Labor Code Section 1198 and Wage Order 4-2001, Section 14
24 by failing to provide suitable seats.

25 23. By reason of this uniform conduct applicable to PLAINTIFFS and all
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, DEFENDANTS committed acts of unfair competition in
27 violation of the California Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the
28 "UCL"), by engaging in a company-wide policy and procedure which failed to accurately

1 calculate and record all missed meal and rest periods by PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA
2 CLASS Members. The proper recording of these employees' missed meal and rest breaks, and
3 proper payment of minimum wages and overtime, is the DEFENDANTS' burden. As a result of
4 DEFENDANTS' intentional disregard of the obligation to meet this burden, DEFENDANTS
5 failed to properly pay all required compensation for work performed by the members of the
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS and violated the California Labor Code and regulations promulgated
7 thereunder as herein alleged.

8 24. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFFS, PLAINTIFFS were from time to time unable to
9 take off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for his rest and meal periods.
10 PLAINTIFFS were required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five
11 (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed
12 to provide PLAINTIFFS with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which he was
13 required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANTS provided
14 PLAINTIFFS with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFFS to remain on the premises, on-duty
15 and on-call, for the rest break. DEFENDANTS' policy caused PLAINTIFFS to remain on-call
16 and on-duty during what was supposed to be her off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore
17 forfeited meal and rest breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with
18 DEFENDANTS' strict corporate policy and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANTS also provided
19 PLAINTIFFS with a paystub that failed to accurately display PLAINTIFFS' correct time worked
20 and wages, as well as payments for missed meal and rest periods for certain pay periods in
21 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a). To date, DEFENDANTS have not fully paid PLAINTIFFS
22 the overtime compensation still owed to her or any penalty wages owed to her under Cal. Lab.
23 Code § 203. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or
24 value of \$75,000.

25 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

26 25. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil
27 Procedure, Section 410.10 and California Business & Professions Code, Section 17203. This
28

1 action is brought as a Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and similarly situated employees of
2 DEFENDANT pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

3 26. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
4 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANTS (i) currently maintain and at all relevant times
5 maintained offices and facilities in this County and/or conduct substantial business in this County,
6 and (ii) committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against members of the
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

8 **THE CALIFORNIA CLASS**

9 27. PLAINTIFFS bring the First Cause of Action for Unfair, Unlawful and Deceptive
10 Business Practices pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the "UCL") as a Class
11 Action, pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, on behalf of a California class, defined as all
12 individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and classified
13 as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning
14 four (4) years prior to the filing of the original complaint and ending on the date as determined by
15 the Court (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate
16 claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

17 28. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA
18 CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted
19 accordingly.

20 29. DEFENDANTS, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in
21 violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order
22 requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and
23 willfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANTS systematically failed to record all meal
24 and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS,
25 even though DEFENDANTS enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees to perform
26 this work and permitted or suffered to permit this work.

27 30. DEFENDANTS have the legal burden to establish that each and every
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member was paid accurately and was provided all meal and rest breaks

missed as required by California laws. DEFENDANTS, however, as a matter of uniform and systematic policy and procedure failed to have in place during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD and still fails to have in place a policy or practice to ensure that each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member is paid as required by law, so as to satisfy its burden. This common business practice applicable to each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member can be adjudicated on a class-wide basis as unlawful, unfair, and/or deceptive under Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”) as causation, damages, and reliance are not elements of this claim.

31. The CALIFORNIA CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is impracticable.

32. DEFENDANTS uniformly violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA CLASS under California law by:

- a. Violating the California Unfair Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by unlawfully, unfairly and/or deceptively having in place company policies, practices and procedures that failed to pay all wages due the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked;
- b. Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the California Unfair Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by failing to provide mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members;
- c. Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the California Unfair Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*, by violating Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members with necessary expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties; and
- d. Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by unlawfully, unfairly and/or deceptively having in place company policies, practices and procedures that uniformly and systematically failed to record and pay PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA

1 CLASS for all time worked, including minimum wages owed and overtime wages
2 owed for work performed by these employees.

3 33. The Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a Class
4 Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 5 a. The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that the
6 joinder of all such persons is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as a
7 class will benefit the parties and the Court;
- 8 b. Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that are
9 raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS will apply
10 uniformly to every member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- 11 c. The claims of the representative PLAINTIFFS are typical of the claims of each
12 member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFFS, like all the other members
13 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, were classified as a non- exempt employee paid on
14 an hourly basis who was subjected to the DEFENDANTS' deceptive practice and
15 policy which failed to provide the legally required meal and rest periods to the
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS and thereby systematically underpaid compensation to
17 PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic
18 injury as a result of DEFENDANTS' employment practices. PLAINTIFFS, like
19 all the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, were subjected to the uniform
20 employment practices of DEFENDANTS and was a non-exempt employee paid
21 on an hourly basis and paid additional non-discretionary incentive wages who was
22 subjected to the DEFENDANTS' practice and policy which failed to pay the
23 correct rate of overtime wages due to the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all overtime
24 worked by the CALIFORNIA CLASS and thereby systematically under pays
25 overtime compensation to the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFFS and the
26 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were and are similarly or identically
27 harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive, unfair and pervasive pattern of
28 misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANTS; and

1 d. The representative PLAINTIFFS will fairly and adequately represent and protect
2 the interest of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and has retained counsel who are
3 competent and experienced in Class Action litigation. There are no material
4 conflicts between the claims of the representative PLAINTIFFS and the members
5 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that would make class certification inappropriate.
6 Counsel for the CALIFORNIA CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of all
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

8 34. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action is
9 properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

10 a. Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory
11 and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of separate actions
12 by individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS will create the risk of:

13 i. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members
14 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish incompatible
15 standards of conduct for the parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
16 and/or;

17 ii. Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA
18 CLASS which would as a practical matter be dispositive of interests of the
19 other members not party to the adjudication or substantially impair or
20 impede their ability to protect their interests.

21 b. The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS have acted or refused to act on
22 grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS, making appropriate
23 class-wide relief with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole in that
24 DEFENDANT uniformly failed to pay all wages due for all time worked by the
25 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS as required by law;

26 i. With respect to the First Cause of Action, the final relief on behalf of the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS sought does not relate exclusively to restitution
28 because through this claim PLAINTIFFS seek declaratory relief holding

1 that the DEFENDANTS' policy and practices constitute unfair
2 competition, along with declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and incidental
3 equitable relief as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct
4 declared to constitute unfair competition;

5 c. Common questions of law and fact exist as to the members of the CALIFORNIA
6 CLASS, with respect to the practices and violations of California law as listed
7 above, and predominate over any question affecting only individual
8 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, and a Class Action is superior to other available
9 methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including
10 consideration of:

11 i. The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in individually
12 controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions in that the
13 substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to recover the
14 relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the individual
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members when compared to the substantial
16 expense and burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;

17 ii. Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation
18 that would create the risk of:

19 1. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
20 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, which would establish
21 incompatible standards of conduct for the DEFENDANTS; and/or;

22 2. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS would as a practical matter be dispositive
24 of the interests of the other members not parties to the adjudication
25 or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their
26 interests;

27 iii. In the context of wage litigation, because a substantial number of
28 individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting their legal

1 rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANTS, which may adversely
2 affect an individual's job with DEFENDANTS or with a subsequent
3 employer, the Class Action is the only means to assert their claims through
4 a representative; and

5 iv. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and
6 efficient adjudication of this litigation because class treatment will obviate
7 the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative litigation that is likely to
8 result in the absence of certification of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of
9 Civ. Proc. § 382.

10 35. The Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant
11 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

- 12 a. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS predominate
13 over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
14 because the DEFENDANTS' employment practices are uniform and
15 systematically applied with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS.
- 16 b. A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient
17 adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS because
18 in the context of employment litigation a substantial number of individual
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting their rights individually out
20 of fear of retaliation or adverse impact on their employment;
- 21 c. The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that it is impractical
22 to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS before the Court;
- 23 d. PLAINTIFFS, and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, will not be able to
24 obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a
25 Class Action;
- 26 e. There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief
27 for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and other improprieties, and
28

1 in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries which
2 DEFENDANTS' actions have inflicted upon the CALIFORNIA CLASS;

- 3 f. There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
4 DEFENDANTS are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- 6 g. DEFENDANTS have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
7 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, thereby making final class-wide relief appropriate
8 with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole;
- 9 h. The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are readily ascertainable from the
10 business records of DEFENDANTS; and
- 11 i. Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring an
12 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims
13 arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANTS as to the members of the
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

15 36. DEFENDANTS maintain records from which the Court can ascertain and identify
16 by job title each of DEFENDANTS' employees who as have been systematically, intentionally
17 and uniformly subjected to DEFENDANTS' company policy, practices and procedures as herein
18 alleged. PLAINTIFFS will seek leave to amend the Complaint to include any additional job titles
19 of similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

20 **THE CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

21 37. PLAINTIFFS further bring the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh,
22 Eighth, Ninth, and Tenth causes of Action on behalf of a California sub-class, defined as all
23 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA
24 LABOR SUB-CLASS") at any time during the period three (3) years prior to the filing of the
25 original complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA
26 LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD") pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382. The amount in
27 controversy for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is under
28 five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

1 38. DEFENDANTS, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in
2 violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order
3 requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and
4 willfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANTS failed to correctly pay for the time
5 worked by PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS,
6 and other wages and premiums owed to these employees, even though DEFENDANTS enjoyed
7 the benefit of this work, required employees to perform this work and permitted or suffered to
8 permit this overtime work. DEFENDANTS have uniformly denied these CALIFORNIA LABOR
9 SUB-CLASS Members wages to which these employees are entitled in order to unfairly cheat the
10 competition and unlawfully profit. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the
11 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
12 CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

13 39. DEFENDANTS maintain records from which the Court can ascertain and identify
14 by name and job title, each of DEFENDANTS’ employees who have been systematically,
15 intentionally and uniformly subjected to DEFENDANT’S company policy, practices and
16 procedures as herein alleged. PLAINTIFFS will seek leave to amend the Complaint to include
17 any additional job titles of similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

18 40. The CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all
19 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is impracticable

20 41. Common questions of law and fact exist as to members of the CALIFORNIA
21 LABOR SUB-CLASS, including, but not limited, to the following:

- 22 a. Whether DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to correctly calculate and pay
23 compensation due to members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB- CLASS for
24 missed meal and rest breaks in violation of the California Labor Code and
25 California regulations and the applicable California Wage Order;
- 26 b. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and the other members
27 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with legally required uninterrupted
28 thirty (30) minute meal breaks and rest periods;

- 1 c. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and the other members
- 2 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with accurate itemized wage
- 3 statements;
- 4 d. Whether DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to pay overtime compensation to
- 5 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS in violation of the
- 6 California Labor Code and California regulations and the applicable California
- 7 Wage Order;
- 8 e. Whether the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are entitled to
- 9 compensation for time worked, including overtime worked, under the overtime
- 10 pay requirements of California law;
- 11 f. Whether DEFENDANTS have engaged in unfair competition by the above-listed
- 12 conduct;
- 13 g. The proper measure of damages and penalties owed to the members of the
- 14 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; and
- 15 h. Whether DEFENDANTS' conduct was willful.

16 42. DEFENDANTS violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
17 under California law by:

- 18 a. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, *et seq.*, by failing to correctly pay PLAINTIFFS
- 19 and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS all wages due for
- 20 overtime worked, for which DEFENDANTS are liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code
- 21 § 1194;
- 22 b. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1 *et seq.*, by failing to accurately
- 23 pay PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
- 24 the correct minimum wage pay for which DEFENDANTS are liable pursuant to
- 25 Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1197;
- 26 c. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512, by failing to provide PLAINTIFFS
- 27 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with all legally required off-
- 28

duty, uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal breaks and the legally required rest breaks;

- d. Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 226, by failing to provide PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with an accurate itemized statement in writing showing all accurate rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each overtime rate by the employee;
- e. Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members with necessary expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties;
- f. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and/or 203, which provides that when an employee is discharged or quits from employment, the employer must pay the employee all wages due without abatement, by failing to tender full payment and/or restitution of wages owed or in the manner required by California law to the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS who have terminated their employment.

43. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a Class Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- a. The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so numerous that the joinder of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as a class will benefit the parties and the Court;
- b. Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that are raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and will apply uniformly to every member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;
- c. The claims of the representative PLAINTIFFS are typical of the claims of each member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABORSUB-CLASS, was a non-exempt

1 employee paid on an hourly basis and paid additional non-discretionary incentive
2 wages who was subjected to the DEFENDANTS' practice and policy which failed
3 to pay the correct rate of overtime wages and total amount of wages due to the
4 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFFS sustained economic injury
5 as a result of DEFENDANTS' employment practices. PLAINTIFFS and the
6 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were and are similarly or
7 identically harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive, unfair and pervasive pattern
8 of misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANTS; and

- 9 d. The representative PLAINTIFFS will fairly and adequately represent and protect
10 the interest of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and have retained
11 counsel who are competent and experienced in Class Action litigation. There are
12 no material conflicts between the claims of the representative PLAINTIFFS and
13 the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS that would make class
14 certification inappropriate. Counsel for the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
15 will vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
16 Members.

17 44. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action is
18 properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 19 a. Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory
20 and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of separate actions
21 by individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS will create
22 the risk of:
- 23 i. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members
24 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would establish
25 incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the
26 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; or
- 27 ii. Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA
28 LABOR SUB-CLASS which would as a practical matter be dispositive of

1 interests of the other members not party to the adjudication or substantially
2 impair or impede their ability to protect their interests.

3 b. The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have acted or
4 refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR
5 SUB-CLASS, making appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole in that DEFENDANT uniformly
7 failed to pay all wages due for all time worked by the members of the
8 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as required by law;

9 c. Common questions of law and fact predominate as to the members of the
10 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, with respect to the practices and violations
11 of California Law as listed above, and predominate over any question affecting
12 only individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, and a Class
13 Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication
14 of the controversy, including consideration of:

15 i. The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
16 in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions in
17 that the substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to recover
18 the relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the individual
19 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members when compared to the
20 substantial expense and burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;

21 ii. Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation
22 that would create the risk of:

23 1. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
24 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, which
25 would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the
26 DEFENDANTS; and/or,

27 2. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
28 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS would as a practical matter

1 be dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to
2 the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to
3 protect their interests;

4 iii. In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of individual
5 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid asserting their
6 legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANTS, which may
7 adversely affect an individual's job with DEFENDANTS or with a
8 subsequent employer, the Class Action is the only means to assert their
9 claims through a representative; and,

10 iv. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and
11 efficient adjudication of this litigation because class treatment will obviate
12 the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative litigation that is likely to
13 result in the absence of certification of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of
14 Civ. Proc. § 382.

15 45. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant
16 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

17 a. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
18 CLASS predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA
19 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members;

20 b. A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient
21 adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
22 CLASS because in the context of employment litigation a substantial number of
23 individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid asserting
24 their rights individually out of fear of retaliation or adverse impact on their
25 employment;

26 c. The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so numerous that
27 it is impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
28 before the Court;

- 1 d. PLAINTIFFS, and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, will
2 not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is
3 maintained as a Class Action;
- 4 e. There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief
5 for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and other improprieties, and
6 in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries which
7 DEFENDANTS' actions have inflicted upon the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
8 CLASS;
- 9 f. There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
10 DEFENDANTS are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the
11 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- 12 g. DEFENDANTS have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
13 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, thereby making final class-wide relief
14 appropriate with respect to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole;
- 15 h. The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are readily
16 ascertainable from the business records of DEFENDANTS. The CALIFORNIA
17 LABOR SUB-CLASS consists of all CALIFORNIA CLASS Members classified
18 as non-exempt employees during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
19 PERIOD; and
- 20 i. Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring an
21 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims
22 arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANTS as to the members of the
23 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **UNLAWFUL BUSINESS PRACTICES**

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

4 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all DEFENDANTS)**

5 46. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and
6 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this
7 Complaint.

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

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

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

21 49. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS have engaged and continues to
22 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
23 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
24 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 206.5, 221, 223, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197,
25 1197.1, 1198, and 2802 for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief
26 pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the
27 conduct held to constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

1 50. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were unlawful and
2 unfair in that these practices violated public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive
3 unscrupulous or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or
4 utility for which this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section 17203
5 of the California Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages wrongfully
6 withheld.

7 51. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were deceptive and
8 fraudulent in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice failed to pay PLAINTIFF, and
9 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, wages due, failed to accurately to record the time
10 worked, and failed to reimburse for expenses due to a systematic practice that cannot be justified,
11 pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in
12 violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this Court should issue injunctive
13 and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including restitution of wages
14 wrongfully withheld.

15 52. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were also unlawful,
16 unfair and deceptive in that DEFENDANTS' employment practices caused PLAINTIFFS and the
17 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with
18 DEFENDANTS.

19 53. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were also unfair and
20 deceptive in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
21 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

22 54. Therefore, PLAINTIFFS demand on behalf of themselves and on behalf of each
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty meal
24 period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of pay for
25 each workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for each ten (10)
26 hours of work.

1 55. PLAINTIFFS further demand on behalf of themselves and on behalf of each
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which a rest period was
3 not timely provided as required by law.

4 56. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
5 DEFENDANTS have obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFFS and
6 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages, and has deprived them
7 of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and contract, all to the detriment of these
8 employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANTS so as to allow DEFENDANT to unfairly compete
9 against competitors who comply with the law.

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

15 58. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are entitled
16 to, and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to restore to them the money and property which
17 DEFENDANTS have acquired, or of which PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been deprived, by means of the above described unlawful and unfair
19 business practices, including earned but unpaid wages.

20 59. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are further
21 entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the described business practices are unlawful, unfair
22 and deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining DEFENDANTS from
23 engaging in any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

24 60. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no plain,
25 speedy and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business practices of
26 DEFENDANTS. Further, the practices herein alleged presently continue to occur unabated. As a
27 result of the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein, PLAINTIFFS and the other
28 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable legal

1 and economic harm unless DEFENDANTS are restrained from continuing to engage in these
2 unlawful and unfair business practices.

3 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

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

6 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against ALL**
7 **DEFENDANTS)**

8 61. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS,
9 reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of
10 this Complaint.

11 62. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
12 bring a claim for DEFENDANTS' willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code
13 and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANTS' failure to accurately
14 calculate and pay minimum wages to PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

17 64. Cal. Lab. Code § 1197 provides the minimum wage for employees fixed by the
18 commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a wage less than
19 the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

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

22 66. DEFENDANTS maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFFS and
23 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS without regard to the correct
24 amount of time they work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT'S uniform policy and practice was
25 to unlawfully and intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFFS and the other
26 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

27 67. DEFENDANTS' uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
28 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result

1 of implementing a uniform policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFFS
2 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS in regards to minimum wage
3 pay.

4 68. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANTS
5 inaccurately calculated the correct time worked and consequently underpaid the actual time
6 worked by PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.
7 DEFENDANTS acted in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other
8 benefits in violation of the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission
9 requirements and other applicable laws and regulations.

10 69. As a direct result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
11 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS did not receive
12 the correct minimum wage compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANTS.

13 70. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the
14 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were paid less for time worked than
15 they were entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

16 71. By virtue of DEFENDANTS' unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
17 compensation to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
18 CLASS for the true time they worked, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
19 LABOR SUB-CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts
20 which are presently unknown to them and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

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

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

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

20 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME COMPENSATION**

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

23 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against ALL**
24 **DEFENDANTS)**

25 75. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS,
26 reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of
27 this Complaint.
28

1 76. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
2 bring a claim for DEFENDANTS' willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code
3 and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANTS' failure to accurately
4 calculate the applicable rates for all overtime worked by PLAINTIFFS and other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and DEFENDANTS' failure to properly compensate the
6 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for overtime worked, including, work
7 performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

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

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

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

18 80. DEFENDANTS maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFFS and
19 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS without regard to the correct
20 amount of overtime worked and correct applicable overtime rate for the amount of overtime they
21 worked. As set forth herein, DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and
22 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due for the overtime worked by PLAINTIFFS and
23 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and DEFENDANTS in fact
24 failed to pay these employees the correct applicable overtime wages for all overtime worked.

25 81. DEFENDANTS' uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
26 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result
27 of implementing a uniform policy and practice that denied accurate compensation to
28 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for all

1 overtime worked, including, the work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or
2 forty (40) hours in any workweek.

3 82. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANTS
4 inaccurately calculated the amount of overtime worked and the applicable overtime rates and
5 consequently underpaid the actual time worked by PLAINTIFFS and other members of the
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. DEFENDANTS acted in an illegal attempt to avoid the
7 payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code, the
8 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and regulations.

9 83. As a direct result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
10 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS did not receive
11 full compensation for all overtime worked.

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

20 85. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and the
21 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were paid less for time worked than
22 they were entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

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

1 to accurately record and pay using the applicable overtime rate as evidenced by DEFENDANT'S
2 business records and witnessed by employees.

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

8 88. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFFS and the other
9 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are under compensated for their overtime
10 worked. DEFENDANTS systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
11 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice
12 and procedure, and DEFENDANTS perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay
13 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS the applicable
14 overtime rate.

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

23 90. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
24 therefore request recovery of all unpaid wages, including overtime wages, according to proof,
25 interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against
26 DEFENDANTS, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable
27 statutes. To the extent overtime compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA
28 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members who have terminated their employment, DEFENDANTS'

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

6 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL PERIODS**

8 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

9 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
10 **DEFENDANTS)**

11 91. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
12 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
13 paragraphs of this Complaint.

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

27 93. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable
28 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-

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

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

7 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST PERIODS**

9 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

10 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
11 **DEFENDANTS)**

12 95. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
13 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
14 paragraphs of this Complaint.

15 96. PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were
16 required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods.
17 Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some
18 shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10)
19 minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and
20 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more.
21 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were also not provided
22 with one hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFFS
23 and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were periodically denied their proper
24 rest periods by DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers. When DEFENDANTS provided
25 PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members with rest break, they
26 required PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members to stay on
27 DEFENDANTS' premises for those rest breaks.

1 97. DEFENDANTS further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the
2 applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA LABOR
3 SUB-CLASS Members who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with the applicable
4 Wage Order, one additional hour of compensation at each employee’s regular rate of pay for each
5 workday that rest period was not provided.

6 98. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFFS and
7 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according to
8 proof at trial, and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.

9 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS**

11 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226 and 226.2)**

12 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
13 **DEFENDANTS)**

14 99. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
15 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
16 paragraphs of this Complaint.

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

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

- f. The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;
- g. The name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number may be shown on the itemized statement;
- h. The name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and
- i. All applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

101. Cal. Labor Code § 226.2 provides that an employer must furnish piece-rate employees with an “accurate itemized” statement in writing showing:

- a. The total hours of compensable rest and recovery periods, the rate of compensation, and the gross wages paid for those periods during the pay period; and
- b. The total hours of other nonproductive time, the rate of compensation, and the gross wages paid for that time during the pay period.

102. When DEFENDANTS did not accurately record PLAINTIFFS’ and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’ wages, including overtime wages, owed, DEFENDANTS also failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the correct overtime rate, the correct number of hours worked, missed meal and rest periods, owed to PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. Aside from the violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANTS failed to issue to PLAINTIFFS an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226 *et seq.* From time to time DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section

226(a)(2) by failing to provide an accurate amount of total hours worked by PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Specifically, DEFENDANTS included items, including but not limited to “Sick” to the total hours worked. However, the foregoing item is not considered total hours worked for purposes of California Labor Code Section 226(a)(2). Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time failed to issue an itemized wage statement to PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that included the total hours worked and/or the applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. As a result, from time to time DEFENDANTS provided PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

///

///

///

///

///

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRES EXPENSES

(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)

**(Alleged by PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all
DEFENDANTS)**

104. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

105. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, 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.

106. At all relevant times herein, DEFENDANTS violated Cal. Lab. Code § 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANT's benefit. DEFENDANTS failed to reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to using their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANTS. Specifically, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANTS to use their personal cell phones for work related issues. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy, practice and procedure was to not reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for expenses resulting from using their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANTS within the course and scope of their employment for DEFENDANTS. These expenses were necessary to complete their principal job duties. DEFENDANTS is estopped by DEFENDANTS' conduct to assert any waiver of this expectation. Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members, DEFENDANTS failed to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA

LABOR SUB-CLASS members for these expenses as an employer is required to do under the laws and regulations of California.

107. PLAINTIFFS therefore demands reimbursement for expenditures or losses incurred by them and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANTS, or their obedience to the directions of DEFENDANTS, with interest at the statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY WAGES WHEN DUE

(Cal. Lab. Code §§201, 202, 203)

(Alleged by PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all DEFENDANTS)

108. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

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

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

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

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

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.

112. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFFS' or any CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members' employment contract.

113. 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.

114. The employment of PLAINTIFFS and many CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members terminated and DEFENDANTS have not tendered payment of wages, to these employees who missed meal and rest breaks, as required by law.

115. Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of herself and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS whose employment has, PLAINTIFFS demands up to thirty days of pay as penalty for not paying all wages due at time of termination for all employees who terminated employment during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, and demands an accounting and payment of all wages due, plus interest and statutory costs as allowed by law.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Unlawful Deductions from PLAINTIFFS and CLASS MEMBERS Paychecks

[Cal. Labor Code §§ 221 and 223]

(By PLAINTIFFS and the CLASS MEMBERS Against all DEFENDANTS)

116. PLAINTIFF incorporate herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in the preceding paragraphs.

117. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT regularly and consistently maintained corporate policies and procedures designed to reduce labor costs by reducing or minimizing the amount of compensation paid to its employees, especially overtime compensation.

118. DEFENDANT made deductions from PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS paychecks including but limited to amounts for 401(k)

1 retirement plans earned by PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
2 SUB-CLASS during various pay periods.

3 119. Labor Code § 221 provides it is unlawful for any employer to collect or receive
4 from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by employer to employee.

5 120. Labor Code § 223 provides that where any statute or contract requires an employer
6 to maintain the designated wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while
7 purporting to pay the wage designated by statute or by contract. Labor Code section 225 further
8 provides that the violation of any provision of Labor Code §§ 221 and 223 is a misdemeanor.

9 121. As a result of the conduct alleged above, DEFENDANTS unlawfully collected or
10 received from PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
11 part of the wages paid to their employees.

12 122. Wherefore, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
13 SUB-CLASS demand the return of all wages unlawfully deducted from the paychecks, including
14 interest thereon, penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code
15 §§ 225.5 and 1194.

16 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

18 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§2698 et seq.)**

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

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

22 124. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state
23 labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who does so as the proxy or agent of the
24 state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under PAGA is
25 fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to benefit private
26 parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution, but to create a means
27 of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code. In enacting
28 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.

125. PLAINTIFF Nayyar, 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 themselves and all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANTS and classified as non-exempt employees in California during the time period of May 3, 2020 until the present (the "AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES").

126. On May 3, 2021, PLAINTIFF Nayyar gave written notice by certified mail to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and the employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. See Exhibit #1, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference herein. The statutory waiting period for Plaintiff to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, Plaintiff may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

127. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful business act or practice because DEFENDANTS, among other things, (a) failed to properly record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all of the hours they worked, including overtime hours in violation of the Wage Order, (b) failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements, (c) failed to provide mandatory meal breaks and rest breaks, (d) failed to timely pay wages, and (e) failed to provide suitable seating, all in violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §2699.5, including but not limited to Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 223, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1199, 2802, 2804, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), and applicable wage orders, and thereby gives rise to statutory penalties as a result of such conduct. PLAINTIFF Nayyar hereby seeks recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004

1 as the representative of the State of California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFF
2 and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

3 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

4 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF pray for a judgment against each DEFENDANTS, jointly
5 and severally, as follows:

6 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

17 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS:

- 18 a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and
19 Ninth, Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a
20 class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
21 b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory
22 damages for minimum wages, overtime wages, unreimbursed expenses, and other
23 compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
24 LABOR SUB-CLASS, during the applicable CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
25 CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;
26 c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and
27 the applicable IWC Wage Order;
28 d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in

1 which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per member of the
2 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay
3 period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and
4 an award of costs for violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226; and,

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

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

10 a. Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorneys
11 General Act of 2004

12 4. On all claims:

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

14 b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and

15 c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as allowable under the law,
16 including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 218.5, § 226, §1194, §1197
17 and/or §2802.

18 DATED: July 12, 2021

19
20 **JCL LAW FIRM, APC**

21 By: 

22 Jean-Claude Lapuyade
23 Attorney for Plaintiffs
24
25
26
27
28

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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: July 12, 2021

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

By: 
Jean-Claude Lapuyade
Attorney for Plaintiffs

EXHIBIT 1



3990 Old Town Avenue, Suite C204
San Diego, CA 92110
Tel: 619-599-8292
Fax: 619-599-8291
Toll Free: 1-888-498-6999
www.jcl-lawfirm.com
Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com

May 3, 2021

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

PIZZA INVESTMENT ENTREPRENEURS, L.L.C. c/o DAN ABFALTER 5041 THALIA DR EL DORADO HILLS, CA 95762 <i>Via Certified Mail with Return Receipt</i> <i>No. 7021 0350 0001 8165 1804</i>	
--	--

Re: Notice of Violations of California Labor Code Sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 223, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1199, 2802, 2804, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.5

Dear Sir/Madam:

This office represents JACQUELINE NAYYAR (“Plaintiff”) and other aggrieved employees in a proposed class and representative action against PIZZA INVESTMENT ENTREPRENEURS, L.L.C. (“Defendant”). This office intends to file the enclosed Class Action Complaint on behalf of Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees. The purpose of this correspondence is to provide the Labor and Workforce Development Agency with notice of alleged violations of the California Labor Code and certain facts and theories in support of the alleged violations in accordance with Labor Code section 2699.3.

Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from December of 2017 to July of 2020. Plaintiff was paid on an hourly basis and entitled to legally required meal and rest periods. At all times during his employment, Defendant failed to, among other things, provide Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated, with all legally mandated off-duty meal and rest periods.

As a consequence, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to fully compensate her, and other similarly situated and aggrieved employees, for all earned wages and failed to provide California-compliant meal and rest breaks and accurate wage statements. Accordingly, Plaintiff contends that Defendant’s conduct violated Labor Code sections §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 223, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1199, 2802, 2804, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), and applicable wage orders, and is therefore actionable pursuant to section 2698 *et seq.*

A true and correct copy of the proposed Complaint for the class action is attached hereto. The Complaint (i) identifies the alleged violations, (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (iii) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (iv) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to the Plaintiff, and (v) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendant. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein.

If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask. The class action lawsuit consists of a class of other aggrieved employees. As class counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the class wide claims as alleged in the Complaint, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Act of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all aggrieved California employees and Class Members

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

Very truly yours,
JCL LAW FIRM, APC

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

Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.

Enclosure (1)

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC
Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
3990 Old Town Avenue, Suite C204
San Diego, CA 92110
Telephone: (619)255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203

JCL LAW FIRM, APC
Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
3990 Old Town Avenue, Suite C204
San Diego, CA 92110
Telephone: (619)599-8292
Facsimile: (619) 599-8291

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SOLANO**

JACQUELINE NAYYAR, an individual, on
behalf of herself and on behalf of all persons
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PIZZA INVESTMENT
ENTREPRENEURS, L.L.C., a Nevada
limited liability company; and DOES 1-50,
Inclusive,

DEFENDANTS.

Case No:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1) UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §17200 *et seq*;
- 2) FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1;
- 3) FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 510, *et seq*;
- 4) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
- 5) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
- 6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§226 and 226.2;
- 7) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
- 8) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
- 9) UNLAWFUL DEDUCTIONS;
- 10) VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 1198 and CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 8, SECTION 1 1070(14) (FAILURE TO PROVIDE SEATING)

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff Jaqueline Nayyar an individual, (“PLAINTIFF”), on behalf of herself and all other
2 similarly situated current and former employees, allege on information and belief, except for their
3 own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

4 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

5 1. Defendant PIZZA INVESTMENT ENTREPRENEURS, L.L.C.
6 (“DEFENDANT” and/or “DEFENDANTS”) is a Limited Liability Company and at all relevant
7 times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business
8 throughout California.

9 2. DEFENDANT operates Picology Pizzeria locations, including locations
10 throughout the State of California, including the Solano County, California location where
11 PLAINTIFF worked.

12 3. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California as a non-exempt
13 employee entitled to minimum wages, overtime pay and meal and rest periods from December
14 2017 to July 2020.

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

22 5. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses incurred during
24 the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANT’S uniform policy and practice
25 which failed to lawfully compensate these employees for all their time worked. DEFENDANT’S
26 uniform policy and practice alleged herein is an unlawful, unfair and deceptive business practice
27 whereby DEFENDANT retained and continues to retain wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other
28 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future,

relief for the named PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically injured by DEFENDANT past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable relief.

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

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

THE CONDUCT

8. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and the 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, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT'S control. Specifically, PLAINTIFF performed work before and after the beginning of her shift, spending time under the DEFENDANTS' control for which she was not compensated. As a result, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS

1 Members forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their
2 time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and
3 overtime rates. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business
5 records.

6 9. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
7 CLASS Members were also from time to time unable to take off duty meal breaks and were not
8 fully relieved of duty for meal periods. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
9 Members were from time to time interrupted during their off-duty meal breaks to complete tasks
10 for DEFENDANTS. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to
11 perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without
12 receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which
14 these employees were required by DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work.
15 DEFENDANTS' policy caused PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to
16 remain on-call and on-duty during what was supposed to be their off-duty meal periods.
17 PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members therefore forfeited meal breaks
18 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS' strict corporate policy
19 and practice.

20 10. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, from time to time, PLAINTIFF and
21 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours
22 without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their
23 first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4)
24 hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between
25 six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for
26 some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more. When they did have an opportunity to take their
27 rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were often interrupted and
28 required by DEFENDANTS to work during their rest breaks. When they did have an opportunity

1 to take their rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to
2 remain on the premises, on-duty and on-call, and subject to DEFENDANTS' control in
3 accordance with DEFENDANTS' policy. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
4 Members were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. DEFENDANTS' policy
5 caused PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to remain on the premises, on-
6 call and on-duty during what was supposed to be their off-duty rest periods. As a result of their
7 rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were
8 periodically denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers.

9 11. Under California law, every employer shall pay to each employee, on the
10 established payday for the period involved, not less than the applicable minimum wage for all
11 hours worked in the payroll period, whether the remuneration is measured by time, piece,
12 commission, or otherwise. Hours worked is defined in the applicable Wage Order as "the time
13 during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the
14 employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so." PLAINTIFF and
15 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time required to perform work for
16 DEFENDANTS before and after their scheduled shifts, as well as during their off-duty meal
17 breaks. DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
18 Members for any of the time spent under DEFENDANTS' control while working off-the-clock.
19 As such, DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
20 the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in a payroll period.

21 12. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
22 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANTS as a
23 matter of company policy, practice and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to
24 compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time
25 worked. This uniform policy and practice of DEFENDANTS is intended to purposefully avoid
26 the payment of the correct compensation as required by California law which allowed
27 DEFENDANTS to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who complied
28

1 with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS
2 against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

3 13. From time to time, when PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
4 worked during what was supposed to be their meal breaks or otherwise off the clock,
5 DEFENDANTS also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
6 CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things,
7 the correct time worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday
8 and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek, and the gross wages paid for those periods during the
9 pay period, and the correct penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods in violation of
10 California Labor Code Sections 226 and 226.2.

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

19 15. Aside from the violations listed herein, DEFENDANTS failed to issue to
20 PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor
21 Code 226 *et seq.* From time to time DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section
22 226(a)(2) by failing to provide an accurate amount of total hours worked by PLAINTIFF and
23 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Specifically, DEFENDANTS included items,
24 including but not limited to "Sick" to the total hours worked. However, the foregoing item is not
25 considered total hours worked for purposes of California Labor Code Section 226(a)(2). Further,
26 DEFENDANTS from time to time failed to issue an itemized wage statement to PLAINTIFF and
27 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that included the total hours worked and/or the
28 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours

1 worked at each hourly rate by PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. As
2 a result, from time to time DEFENDANTS provided PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

15 17. In the course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
16 Members as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANTS to use their own personal
17 cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for
18 DEFENDANTS but were not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANTS for the cost
19 associated with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANTS' benefit. Specifically,
20 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANTS to
21 use their personal cell phones for work related issues. As a result, in the course of their
22 employment with DEFENDANTS the PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS incurred unreimbursed business expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs
24 related to the use of their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of
25 DEFENDANTS.

26 18. Further, DEFENDANT unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF and
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' pay for 401(k) retirement plans without authorization to do so
28

1 or notice to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. As a result, DEFENDANT
2 violated Labor Code § 221.

3 19. PLAINTIFF further alleges that the station counters in DEFENDANT's stores
4 provide ample space behind each counter area to allow for the presence and use of a stool or seat
5 by DEFENDANT's employees' during the performance of their work duties. DEFENDANT's
6 employees' working at DEFENDANT's stores spend a very substantial portion, and, in many
7 workdays, the vast majority of their working time behind these counters. The nature of the position
8 can reasonably be accomplished while using a seat/stool.

9 20. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
10 requirements of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order,
11 DEFENDANT as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, intentionally, knowingly
12 and systematically failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other Aggrieved Employees suitable
13 seating when the nature of these employees' work reasonably permitted sitting.

14 21. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved
15 Employees were entitled to suitable seating and/or were entitled to sit when it did not interfere
16 with the performance of their duties, and that DEFENDANT did not provide suitable seating
17 and/or did not allow them to sit when it did not interfere with the performance of their duties. By
18 reason of this conduct applicable to PLAINTIFF and all Aggrieved Employees, DEFENDANT
19 violated California Labor Code Section 1198 and Wage Order 4-2001, Section 14 by failing to
20 provide suitable seats.

21 22. By reason of this uniform conduct applicable to PLAINTIFF and all
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, DEFENDANTS committed acts of unfair competition in
23 violation of the California Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the
24 "UCL"), by engaging in a company-wide policy and procedure which failed to accurately
25 calculate and record all missed meal and rest periods by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
26 CLASS Members. The proper recording of these employees' missed meal and rest breaks, and
27 proper payment of minimum wages and overtime, is the DEFENDANTS' burden. As a result of
28 DEFENDANTS' intentional disregard of the obligation to meet this burden, DEFENDANTS

1 failed to properly pay all required compensation for work performed by the members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS and violated the California Labor Code and regulations promulgated
3 thereunder as herein alleged.

4 23. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
5 off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for his rest and meal periods.
6 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5)
7 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to
8 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which he was required
9 by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANTS provided PLAINTIFF
10 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on the premises, on-duty and on-call, for
11 the rest break. DEFENDANTS' policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during
12 what was supposed to be her off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest
13 breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS' strict corporate
14 policy and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANTS also provided PLAINTIFF with a paystub that
15 failed to accurately display PLAINTIFF's correct time worked and wages, as well as payments
16 for missed meal and rest periods for certain pay periods in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a).
17 To date, DEFENDANTS have not fully paid PLAINTIFF the overtime compensation still owed
18 to her or any penalty wages owed to her under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy
19 for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

20 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

25 25. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
26 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANTS (i) currently maintain and at all relevant times
27 maintained offices and facilities in this County and/or conduct substantial business in this County,
28

1 and (ii) committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

3 ///

4 ///

5
6 **THE CALIFORNIA CLASS**

7 26. PLAINTIFF brings the First Cause of Action for Unfair, Unlawful and Deceptive
8 Business Practices pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the "UCL") as a Class
9 Action, pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, on behalf of a California class, defined as all
10 individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and classified
11 as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning
12 four (4) years prior to the filing of the original complaint and ending on the date as determined by
13 the Court (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate
14 claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

15 27. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA
16 CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted
17 accordingly.

18 28. DEFENDANTS, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in
19 violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order
20 requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and
21 willfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANTS systematically failed to record all meal
22 and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS,
23 even though DEFENDANTS enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees to perform
24 this work and permitted or suffered to permit this work.

25 29. DEFENDANTS have the legal burden to establish that each and every
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member was paid accurately and was provided all meal and rest breaks
27 missed as required by California laws. DEFENDANTS, however, as a matter of uniform and
28 systematic policy and procedure failed to have in place during the CALIFORNIA CLASS

1 PERIOD and still fails to have in place a policy or practice to ensure that each and every
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member is paid as required by law, so as to satisfy its burden. This
3 common business practice applicable to each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member can be
4 adjudicated on a class-wide basis as unlawful, unfair, and/or deceptive under Cal. Business &
5 Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”) as causation, damages, and reliance are not
6 elements of this claim.

7 30. The CALIFORNIA CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all CALIFORNIA
8 CLASS Members is impracticable.

9 31. DEFENDANTS uniformly violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA CLASS under
10 California law by:

- 11 a. Violating the California Unfair Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§
12 17200, *et seq.*, by unlawfully, unfairly and/or deceptively having in place company
13 policies, practices and procedures that failed to pay all wages due the
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked;
- 15 b. Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the California Unfair
16 Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by failing to provide
17 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
18 members;
- 19 c. Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the California Unfair
20 Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*, by violating Cal. Lab.
21 Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
22 members with necessary expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties; and
- 23 d. Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code
24 §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by unlawfully, unfairly and/or deceptively having in place
25 company policies, practices and procedures that uniformly and systematically
26 failed to record and pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA
27 CLASS for all time worked, including minimum wages owed and overtime wages
28 owed for work performed by these employees.

1 32. The Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a Class
2 Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 3 a. The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that the
4 joinder of all such persons is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as a
5 class will benefit the parties and the Court;
- 6 b. Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that are
7 raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS will apply
8 uniformly to every member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- 9 c. The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims of each
10 member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all the other members of
11 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, were classified as a non- exempt employee paid on an
12 hourly basis who was subjected to the DEFENDANTS' deceptive practice and
13 policy which failed to provide the legally required meal and rest periods to the
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS and thereby systematically underpaid compensation to
15 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic injury
16 as a result of DEFENDANTS' employment practices. PLAINTIFF, like all the
17 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, were subjected to the uniform
18 employment practices of DEFENDANTS and was a non-exempt employee paid
19 on an hourly basis and paid additional non-discretionary incentive wages who was
20 subjected to the DEFENDANTS' practice and policy which failed to pay the
21 correct rate of overtime wages due to the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all overtime
22 worked by the CALIFORNIA CLASS and thereby systematically under pays
23 overtime compensation to the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF and the
24 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were and are similarly or identically
25 harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive, unfair and pervasive pattern of
26 misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANTS; and
- 27 d. The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect
28 the interest of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and has retained counsel who are

competent and experienced in Class Action litigation. There are no material conflicts between the claims of the representative PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that would make class certification inappropriate. Counsel for the CALIFORNIA CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

33. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action is properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- a. Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS will create the risk of:
 - i. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and/or;
 - ii. Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would as a practical matter be dispositive of interests of the other members not party to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests.
- b. The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS, making appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole in that DEFENDANT uniformly failed to pay all wages due for all time worked by the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS as required by law;
 - i. With respect to the First Cause of Action, the final relief on behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS sought does not relate exclusively to restitution because through this claim PLAINTIFF seek declaratory relief holding that the DEFENDANTS' policy and practices constitute unfair competition, along with declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and incidental equitable

1 relief as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct declared to
2 constitute unfair competition;

3 c. Common questions of law and fact exist as to the members of the CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS, with respect to the practices and violations of California law as listed
5 above, and predominate over any question affecting only individual
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, and a Class Action is superior to other available
7 methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including
8 consideration of:

9 i. The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in individually
10 controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions in that the
11 substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to recover the
12 relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the individual
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members when compared to the substantial
14 expense and burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;

15 ii. Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation
16 that would create the risk of:

17 1. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
18 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, which would establish
19 incompatible standards of conduct for the DEFENDANTS; and/or;

20 2. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS would as a practical matter be dispositive
22 of the interests of the other members not parties to the adjudication
23 or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their
24 interests;

25 iii. In the context of wage litigation, because a substantial number of
26 individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting their legal
27 rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANTS, which may adversely
28 affect an individual's job with DEFENDANTS or with a subsequent

1 employer, the Class Action is the only means to assert their claims through
2 a representative; and

3 iv. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and
4 efficient adjudication of this litigation because class treatment will obviate
5 the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative litigation that is likely to
6 result in the absence of certification of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of
7 Civ. Proc. § 382.

8 34. The Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant
9 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

- 10 a. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS predominate
11 over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
12 because the DEFENDANTS' employment practices are uniform and
13 systematically applied with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS.
- 14 b. A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient
15 adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS because
16 in the context of employment litigation a substantial number of individual
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting their rights individually out
18 of fear of retaliation or adverse impact on their employment;
- 19 c. The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that it is impractical
20 to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS before the Court;
- 21 d. PLAINTIFF, and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, will not be able to
22 obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a
23 Class Action;
- 24 e. There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief
25 for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and other improprieties, and
26 in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries which
27 DEFENDANTS' actions have inflicted upon the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
28

- 1 f. There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
2 DEFENDANTS are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- 4 g. DEFENDANTS have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
5 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, thereby making final class-wide relief appropriate
6 with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole;
- 7 h. The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are readily ascertainable from the
8 business records of DEFENDANTS; and
- 9 i. Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring an
10 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims
11 arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANTS as to the members of the
12 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

13 35. DEFENDANTS maintain records from which the Court can ascertain and identify
14 by job title each of DEFENDANTS' employees who as have been systematically, intentionally
15 and uniformly subjected to DEFENDANTS' company policy, practices and procedures as herein
16 alleged. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the Complaint to include any additional job titles
17 of similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

18 **THE CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

19 36. PLAINTIFF further bring the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth,
20 Ninth, and Tenth causes of Action on behalf of a California sub-class, defined as all members of
21 the CALIFORNIA CLASS classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR
22 SUB-CLASS") at any time during the period three (3) years prior to the filing of the original
23 complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
24 CLASS PERIOD") pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382. The amount in controversy for the
25 aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is under five million dollars
26 (\$5,000,000.00).

27 37. DEFENDANTS, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in
28 violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order

1 requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and
2 willfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANTS failed to correctly pay for the time
3 worked by PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and
4 other wages and premiums owed to these employees, even though DEFENDANTS enjoyed the
5 benefit of this work, required employees to perform this work and permitted or suffered to permit
6 this overtime work. DEFENDANTS have uniformly denied these CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
7 CLASS Members wages to which these employees are entitled in order to unfairly cheat the
8 competition and unlawfully profit. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the
9 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
10 CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

11 38. DEFENDANTS maintain records from which the Court can ascertain and identify
12 by name and job title, each of DEFENDANTS' employees who have been systematically,
13 intentionally and uniformly subjected to DEFENDANT'S company policy, practices and
14 procedures as herein alleged. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the Complaint to include any
15 additional job titles of similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

16 39. The CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all
17 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is impracticable

18 40. Common questions of law and fact exist as to members of the CALIFORNIA
19 LABOR SUB-CLASS, including, but not limited, to the following:

- 20 a. Whether DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to correctly calculate and pay
21 compensation due to members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB- CLASS for
22 missed meal and rest breaks in violation of the California Labor Code and
23 California regulations and the applicable California Wage Order;
- 24 b. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of
25 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with legally required uninterrupted
26 thirty (30) minute meal breaks and rest periods;

- 1 c. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of
- 2 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with accurate itemized wage
- 3 statements;
- 4 d. Whether DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to pay overtime compensation to
- 5 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS in violation of the
- 6 California Labor Code and California regulations and the applicable California
- 7 Wage Order;
- 8 e. Whether the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are entitled to
- 9 compensation for time worked, including overtime worked, under the overtime
- 10 pay requirements of California law;
- 11 f. Whether DEFENDANTS have engaged in unfair competition by the above-listed
- 12 conduct;
- 13 g. The proper measure of damages and penalties owed to the members of the
- 14 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; and
- 15 h. Whether DEFENDANTS' conduct was willful.
- 16 41. DEFENDANTS violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
- 17 under California law by:
- 18 a. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, *et seq.*, by failing to correctly pay PLAINTIFF
- 19 and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS all wages due for
- 20 overtime worked, for which DEFENDANTS are liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code
- 21 § 1194;
- 22 b. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1 *et seq.*, by failing to accurately
- 23 pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
- 24 the correct minimum wage pay for which DEFENDANTS are liable pursuant to
- 25 Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1197;
- 26 c. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and
- 27 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with all legally required off-duty,
- 28 uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal breaks and the legally required rest breaks;

- d. Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 226, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with an accurate itemized statement in writing showing all accurate rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each overtime rate by the employee;
- e. Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members with necessary expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties;
- f. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and/or 203, which provides that when an employee is discharged or quits from employment, the employer must pay the employee all wages due without abatement, by failing to tender full payment and/or restitution of wages owed or in the manner required by California law to the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS who have terminated their employment.

42. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a Class Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- a. The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so numerous that the joinder of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as a class will benefit the parties and the Court;
- b. Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that are raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and will apply uniformly to every member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;
- c. The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims of each member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABORSUB-CLASS, was a non-exempt employee paid on an hourly basis and paid additional non-discretionary incentive wages who was subjected to the DEFENDANTS' practice and policy which failed

1 to pay the correct rate of overtime wages and total amount of wages due to the
2 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic injury as
3 a result of DEFENDANTS' employment practices. PLAINTIFF and the members
4 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were and are similarly or identically
5 harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive, unfair and pervasive pattern of
6 misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANTS; and

- 7 d. The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect
8 the interest of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and has retained counsel
9 who are competent and experienced in Class Action litigation. There are no
10 material conflicts between the claims of the representative PLAINTIFF and the
11 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS that would make class
12 certification inappropriate. Counsel for the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
13 will vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
14 Members.

15 43. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action is
16 properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 17 a. Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory
18 and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of separate actions
19 by individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS will create
20 the risk of:
- 21 i. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members
22 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would establish
23 incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the
24 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; or
- 25 ii. Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA
26 LABOR SUB-CLASS which would as a practical matter be dispositive of
27 interests of the other members not party to the adjudication or substantially
28 impair or impede their ability to protect their interests.

- 1 b. The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have acted or
2 refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR
3 SUB-CLASS, making appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the
4 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole in that DEFENDANT uniformly
5 failed to pay all wages due for all time worked by the members of the
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as required by law;
- 7 c. Common questions of law and fact predominate as to the members of the
8 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, with respect to the practices and violations
9 of California Law as listed above, and predominate over any question affecting
10 only individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, and a Class
11 Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication
12 of the controversy, including consideration of:
- 13 i. The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
14 in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions in
15 that the substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to recover
16 the relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the individual
17 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members when compared to the
18 substantial expense and burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;
- 19 ii. Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation
20 that would create the risk of:
- 21 1. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
22 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, which
23 would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the
24 DEFENDANTS; and/or,
25 2. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
26 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS would as a practical matter
27 be dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to
28

1 the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to
2 protect their interests;

3 iii. In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of individual
4 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid asserting their
5 legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANTS, which may
6 adversely affect an individual's job with DEFENDANTS or with a
7 subsequent employer, the Class Action is the only means to assert their
8 claims through a representative; and,

9 iv. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and
10 efficient adjudication of this litigation because class treatment will obviate
11 the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative litigation that is likely to
12 result in the absence of certification of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of
13 Civ. Proc. § 382.

14 44. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant
15 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

- 16 a. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
17 CLASS predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA
18 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members;
- 19 b. A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient
20 adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
21 CLASS because in the context of employment litigation a substantial number of
22 individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid asserting
23 their rights individually out of fear of retaliation or adverse impact on their
24 employment;
- 25 c. The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so numerous that
26 it is impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
27 before the Court;
- 28

- 1 d. PLAINTIFF, and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, will
2 not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is
3 maintained as a Class Action;
- 4 e. There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief
5 for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and other improprieties, and
6 in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries which
7 DEFENDANTS' actions have inflicted upon the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
8 CLASS;
- 9 f. There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
10 DEFENDANTS are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the
11 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- 12 g. DEFENDANTS have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
13 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, thereby making final class-wide relief
14 appropriate with respect to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole;
- 15 h. The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are readily
16 ascertainable from the business records of DEFENDANTS. The CALIFORNIA
17 LABOR SUB-CLASS consists of all CALIFORNIA CLASS Members classified
18 as non-exempt employees during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
19 PERIOD; and
- 20 i. Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring an
21 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims
22 arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANTS as to the members of the
23 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **UNLAWFUL BUSINESS PRACTICES**

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

4 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all DEFENDANTS)**

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

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

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

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

21 48. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS have engaged and continues to
22 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
23 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
24 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 206.5, 221, 223, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197,
25 1197.1, 1198, and 2802 for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief
26 pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the
27 conduct held to constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

28 49. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS’ practices were unlawful and
unfair in that these practices violated public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive
unscrupulous or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or
utility for which this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section 17203

1 of the California Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages wrongfully
2 withheld.

3 50. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were deceptive and
4 fraudulent in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice failed to pay PLAINTIFF, and
5 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, wages due, failed to accurately to record the time
6 worked, and failed to reimburse for expenses due to a systematic practice that cannot be justified,
7 pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in
8 violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this Court should issue injunctive
9 and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including restitution of wages
10 wrongfully withheld.

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

15 52. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were also unfair and
16 deceptive in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
17 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

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

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

26 55. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
27 DEFENDANTS have obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFF and the
28 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages, and has deprived them of

1 valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and contract, all to the detriment of these
2 employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANTS so as to allow DEFENDANT to unfairly compete
3 against competitors who comply with the law.

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

9 57. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are entitled to,
10 and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to restore to them the money and property which
11 DEFENDANTS have acquired, or of which PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
12 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been deprived, by means of the above described unlawful and unfair
13 business practices, including earned but unpaid wages.

14 58. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are further
15 entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the described business practices are unlawful, unfair
16 and deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining DEFENDANTS from
17 engaging in any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

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

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

**FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES
(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 and 1197.1)**

**(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against ALL
DEFENDANTS)**

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

61. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS bring a claim for DEFENDANTS' willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANTS' failure to accurately calculate and pay minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

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

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

65. DEFENDANTS maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time they work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT'S uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

66. DEFENDANTS' uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result of implementing a uniform policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS in regards to minimum wage pay.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME COMPENSATION** 16 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 510, 1194 and 1198)**

17 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against ALL**
18 **DEFENDANTS)**

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

22 75. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
23 bring a claim for DEFENDANTS' willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code
24 and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANTS' failure to accurately
25 calculate the applicable rates for all overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the
26 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and DEFENDANTS' failure to properly compensate the
27 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for overtime worked, including, work
28 performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

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

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

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

9 79. DEFENDANTS maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and
10 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS without regard to the correct
11 amount of overtime worked and correct applicable overtime rate for the amount of overtime they
12 worked. As set forth herein, DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and
13 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due for the overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and the
14 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and DEFENDANTS in fact failed
15 to pay these employees the correct applicable overtime wages for all overtime worked.

16 80. DEFENDANTS' uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
17 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result
18 of implementing a uniform policy and practice that denied accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF
19 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for all overtime worked,
20 including, the work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or forty (40) hours
21 in any workweek.

22 81. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANTS
23 inaccurately calculated the amount of overtime worked and the applicable overtime rates and
24 consequently underpaid the actual time worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the
25 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. DEFENDANTS acted in an illegal attempt to avoid the
26 payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code, the
27 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and regulations.

28 82. As a direct result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS did not receive
full compensation for all overtime worked.

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

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

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

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

24 87. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
25 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are under compensated for their overtime
26 worked. DEFENDANTS systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
27 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice
28 and procedure, and DEFENDANTS perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay
overtime rate.

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

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

20 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL PERIODS**

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

23 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
24 **DEFENDANTS)**

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

28 91. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to provide all
the legally required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR
SUB-CLASS Members as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. The nature of

1 the work performed by PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS MEMBERS did
2 not prevent these employees from being relieved of all of their duties for the legally required off-
3 duty meal periods. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other
4 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were often not fully relieved of duty by
5 DEFENDANTS for their meal periods. Additionally, DEFENDANTS' failure to provide
6 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members with legally required meal
7 breaks prior to their fifth (5th) hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.
8 As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
9 therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with
10 DEFENDANTS' strict corporate policy and practice.

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

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

19 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST PERIODS**

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

22 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
23 **DEFENDANTS)**

24 94. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS,
25 reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of
26 this Complaint.

27 95. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were
28 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)

1 minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and
2 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more.
3 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were also not provided
4 with one hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF
5 and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were periodically denied their proper
6 rest periods by DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers. When DEFENDANTS provided
7 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members with rest break, they
8 required PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members to stay on
9 DEFENDANTS' premises for those rest breaks.

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

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

18 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS**
20 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226 and 226.2)**

21 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
22 **DEFENDANTS)**

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

26 99. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with an
27 "accurate itemized" statement in writing showing:

- 28 a. Gross wages earned;

- b. Total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission;
- c. The number of piece rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis;
- d. All deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item;
- e. Net wages earned;
- f. The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;
- g. The name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number may be shown on the itemized statement;
- h. The name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and
- i. All applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

100. Cal. Labor Code § 226.2 provides that an employer must furnish piece-rate employees with an “accurate itemized” statement in writing showing:

- a. The total hours of compensable rest and recovery periods, the rate of compensation, and the gross wages paid for those periods during the pay period; and
- b. The total hours of other nonproductive time, the rate of compensation, and the gross wages paid for that time during the pay period.

101. When DEFENDANTS did not accurately record PLAINTIFF’S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’ wages, including overtime wages, owed, DEFENDANTS also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with complete

1 and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the correct overtime rate,
2 the correct number of hours worked, missed meal and rest periods, owed to PLAINTIFF and other
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides that every employer shall
4 furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing,
5 among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
6 period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. Aside from the
7 violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANTS failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an
8 itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226 *et seq.*
9 From time to time DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section 226(a)(2) by failing
10 to provide an accurate amount of total hours worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS. Specifically, DEFENDANTS included items, including but not limited
12 to “Sick” to the total hours worked. However, the foregoing item is not considered total hours
13 worked for purposes of California Labor Code Section 226(a)(2). Further, DEFENDANTS from
14 time to time failed to issue an itemized wage statement to PLAINTIFF and other members of the
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS that included the total hours worked and/or the applicable hourly rates in
16 effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate
17 by PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. As a result, from time to time
18 DEFENDANTS provided PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with
19 wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

20 102. DEFENDANTS knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Labor
21 Code § 226, causing injury and damages to the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
22 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs
23 expended calculating the correct rates for the overtime worked and the amount of employment
24 taxes which were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult
25 to estimate. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
26 CLASS may elect to recover liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period
27 in which the violation occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a
28 subsequent pay period pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the

1 time of trial (but in no event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and
2 each respective member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS herein).

3 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRES EXPENSES**

5 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

6 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
7 **DEFENDANTS)**

8 103. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS,
9 reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of
10 this Complaint.

11 104. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

12 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures
13 or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his
14 or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even
15 though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions,
16 believed them to be unlawful.

17 105. At all relevant times herein, DEFENDANTS violated Cal. Lab. Code § 2802, by
18 failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
19 members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANT's
20 benefit. DEFENDANTS failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
21 CLASS members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to using their
22 personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANTS. Specifically,
23 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANTS to use
24 their personal cell phones for work related issues. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy, practice and
25 procedure was to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
26 members for expenses resulting from using their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANTS
27 within the course and scope of their employment for DEFENDANTS. These expenses were
28 necessary to complete their principal job duties. DEFENDANTS is estopped by DEFENDANTS'
conduct to assert any waiver of this expectation. Although these expenses were necessary
expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members,

1 DEFENDANTS failed to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA
2 LABOR SUB-CLASS members for these expenses as an employer is required to do under the
3 laws and regulations of California.

4 106. PLAINTIFF therefore demands reimbursement for expenditures or losses incurred
5 by them and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members in the discharge of their job
6 duties for DEFENDANTS, or their obedience to the directions of DEFENDANTS, with interest
7 at the statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

8 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
9 **FAILURE TO PAY WAGES WHEN DUE**
10 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§201, 202, 203)**

11 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
12 **DEFENDANTS)**

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

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

17 As used in this article:(a) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by
18 employees of every description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the
19 standard of time, task, piece, Commission basis, or other method of calculation. (b)
20 "Labor" includes labor, work, or service whether rendered or performed under
contract, subcontract, partnership, station plan, or other agreement if the labor to be
paid for is performed personally by the person demanding payment.

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

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

25 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
26 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
27 thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her
28 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

1 mail if he or she so requests and designates a mailing address. The date of the
2 mailing shall constitute the date of payment for purposes of the requirement to
provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of quitting.

3 111. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF's or any CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
4 CLASS Members' employment contract.

5 112. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

6 If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance
7 with Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is
8 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.

9 113. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
10 Members terminated and DEFENDANTS have not tendered payment of wages, to these
11 employees who missed meal and rest breaks, as required by law.

12 114. Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of herself and the
13 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS whose employment has, PLAINTIFF
14 demands up to thirty days of pay as penalty for not paying all wages due at time of termination
15 for all employees who terminated employment during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
16 PERIOD, and demands an accounting and payment of all wages due, plus interest and statutory
17 costs as allowed by law.

18 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **Unlawful Deductions from PLAINTIFF and CLASS MEMBERS Paychecks**

20 **[Cal. Labor Code §§ 221 and 223]**

21 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CLASS MEMBERS Against all DEFENDANTS)**

22 115. PLAINTIFF incorporate herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the
23 allegations in the preceding paragraphs.

24 116. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT regularly and consistently
25 maintained corporate policies and procedures designed to reduce labor costs by reducing or
26 minimizing the amount of compensation paid to its employees, especially overtime compensation.

27 117. DEFENDANT made deductions from PLAINTIFF and the other members' of the
28 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS paychecks including but limited to amounts for 401(k)

1 retirement plans earned by PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
2 SUB-CLASS during various pay periods.

3 118. Labor Code § 221 provides it is unlawful for any employer to collect or receive
4 from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by employer to employee.

5 119. Labor Code § 223 provides that where any statute or contract requires an employer
6 to maintain the designated wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while
7 purporting to pay the wage designated by statute or by contract. Labor Code section 225 further
8 provides that the violation of any provision of Labor Code §§ 221 and 223 is a misdemeanor.

9 120. As a result of the conduct alleged above, DEFENDANTS unlawfully collected or
10 received from PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
11 part of the wages paid to their employees.

12 121. Wherefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
13 SUB-CLASS demand the return of all wages unlawfully deducted from the paychecks, including
14 interest thereon, penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code
15 §§ 225.5 and 1194.

16 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE SUITABLE SEATING**

18 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§1198 et seq. & California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section**
19 **11070(14))**

20 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CLASS MEMBERS against all Defendants)**

21 122. PLAINTIFF, and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, reallege and incorporate
22 by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, all paragraphs of this Complaint.

23 123. California Labor Code section 1198 makes it illegal to employ an employee under
24 conditions of labor that are prohibited by the applicable wage order.

25 124. California Labor Code section 1198 requires that “. . . the standard conditions of
26 labor fixed by the commission shall be the . . . standard conditions of labor for employees. The
27 employment of any employee . . . under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.
28 California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11070(14)(A) provides that "[a]ll working

1 employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits
2 the use of seats."

3 125. California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11070(14)(B) provides that "[w]hen
4 employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the nature of the work
5 requires standing, an adequate number of suitable seats shall be placed in reasonable proximity to
6 the work area and employees shall be permitted to use such seats when it does not interfere with the
7 performance of their duties."

8 126. DEFENDANT violated California Labor Code section 1198 and California Code of
9 Regulations, Title 8, section 11070(14) because PLAINTIFF and other members of the
10 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were not permitted to sit, even if they were not engaged in
11 active duties. They were not permitted to sit, even when it would not interfere with the performance
12 of their duties, nor were they provided with suitable seats.

13 127. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are
14 entitled to recover all remedies available for violations of California Labor Code section 1198 and
15 California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11070(14)

16 128. Pursuant to the civil penalties provided for in California Labor Code sections 2699
17 (f) and (g), the State of California, PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees are entitled to
18 recover civil penalties of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period
19 for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay
20 period for each subsequent violation, plus costs and attorneys' fees for violation of California
21 Labor Code section 1198.

22 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

23 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF pray for a judgment against each DEFENDANTS, jointly
24 and severally, as follows:

25 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 26 a. That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA
27 CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
28 b. An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining
DEFENDANTS from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;

- 1 c. An order requiring DEFENDANTS to pay all wages and all sums unlawfully
2 withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS; and
- 4 d. Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANT'S' ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund
5 for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANTS' violations due to
6 PLAINTIFF and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.
- 7 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS:
- 8 a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth,
9 Ninth, and Tenth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
10 CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- 11 b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory
12 damages for minimum wages, overtime wages, unreimbursed expenses, and other
13 compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
14 LABOR SUB-CLASS, during the applicable CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
15 CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;
- 16 c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and
17 the applicable IWC Wage Order;
- 18 d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in
19 which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per member of the
20 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay
21 period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and
22 an award of costs for violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226; and,
- 23 e. The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
24 CLASS as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an
25 action therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
- 26 3. On all claims:
- 27 a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
- 28 b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and

c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as allowable under the law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 218.5, § 226, §1194, §1197 and/or §2802.

///

DATED: _____, 2021

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: _____

Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for Plaintiffs

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: _____, 2021

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: _____

Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for Plaintiffs