

1 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

Norman B. Blumenthal (SBN 068687)

2 Kyle R. Nordrehaug (SBN 205975)

Aparajit Bhowmik (SBN 248066)

3 Nicholas J. De Blouw (SBN 280922)

Jeffrey S. Herman (SBN 280058)

4 jeffrey@bamlawca.com

2255 Calle Clara

5 La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858)551-1223

6 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Website: www.bamlawca.com

7 SETAREH LAW GROUP

8 Shaun Setareh (SBN 204514)

shaun@setarehlaw.com

9 Thomas Segal (SBN 222791)

thomas@setarehlaw.com

10 Farrah Grant (SBN 293898)

farrah@setarehlaw.com

11 420 N. Camden Drive, Suite 100

Beverly Hills, California 90210

12 Telephone (310) 888-7771

Facsimile (310) 888-0109

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff LEONARDO CUERVO

15 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

16 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

17 UNLIMITED JURISDICTION

18 LEONARDO CUERVO, an individual, on
19 behalf of himself and on behalf of all persons
20 similarly situated,

21 *Plaintiff,*

22 v.

23 YELP INC., a Corporation; and DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,

24 *Defendants.*

Case No. 26STCV12045

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200;
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;
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

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

09/14/2026

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: _____ S. Drew Deputy

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

- 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;
 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; and,
 9. FAILURE TO PAY SICK PAY WAGES
IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB CODE
§§201-203, 233, 246.
 10. CIVIL PENALTIES IN VIOLATION OF
CAL. LAB. CODE § 2698, et seq.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Leonardo Cuervo (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of himself and all other
2 similarly situated current and former employees, and the general public, alleges on information and
3 belief, except for his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the
4 following.

5 **THE PARTIES**

6 1. Yelp Inc. (“DEFENDANT”) is a corporation that at all relevant times mentioned
7 herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

8 2. DEFENDANT is an American company that develops the Yelp.com website and the
9 Yelp mobile app, which publishes crowd sourced reviews about local businesses.

10 3. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from November 2024, to
11 September 2025. PLAINTIFF was at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt
12 employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and
13 payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

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

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

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically injured by DEFENDANT's past and current
2 unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable relief.

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

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

20 **THE CONDUCT**

21 8. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
22 required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,
23 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all
24 the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without paying them for all the time they are under
26 DEFENDANT's control. Among other things, DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while
27 clocked out during what is supposed to be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was
28 from time to time interrupted by work assignments while clocked out for what should have been

1 PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and
2 procedure, administers a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by
3 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that
4 during the course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are paid
5 less than they would have been paid had they been paid for actual recorded time rather than
6 "rounded" time. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeit
7 minimum wage, overtime wage compensation, and off-duty meal breaks by working without their
8 time being correctly recorded and without compensation at the applicable rates. DEFENDANT's
9 policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time
10 worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

11 9. State and federal law provides that employees must be paid overtime and meal and
12 rest break premiums at one-and-one-half times their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFF and other
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that is tied to
14 specific elements of an employee's performance.

15 10. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
16 Members' compensation is DEFENDANT's non-discretionary incentive program that paid
17 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
18 performance for DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all employees
19 paid on an hourly basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the various
20 performance goals set by DEFENDANT. However, when calculating the regular rate of pay in
21 order to pay overtime and meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
22 CLASS Members, DEFENDANT failed to include the incentive compensation as part of the
23 employees' "regular rate of pay" for purposes of calculating overtime pay and meal and rest break
24 premium pay. Management and supervisors described the incentive program to potential and new
25 employees as part of the compensation package. As a matter of law, the incentive compensation
26 received by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members must be included in the
27 "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted in a underpayment of overtime
28 compensation and meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS

1 Members by DEFENDANT.

2 11. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
3 CLASS Members were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty meal breaks and
4 were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
5 CLASS Members were required from time to time to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT
6 for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further,
7 DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
8 Members with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees were
9 required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. DEFENDANT also engaged in the
10 practice of rounding the meal period times to avoid paying penalties to PLAINTIFF and other
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
12 therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with
13 DEFENDANT's corporate policy and practice.

14 12. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
15 CLASS Members were also required from time to time to work in excess of four (4) hours without
16 being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their first rest
17 periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours from
18 time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of
19 between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third rest period of at
20 least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time.
21 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one hour
22 wages in lieu thereof. Additionally, the applicable California Wage Order requires employers to
23 provide employees with off-duty rest periods, which the California Supreme Court defined as time
24 during which an employee is relieved from all work related duties and free from employer control.
25 In so doing, the Court held that the requirement under California law that employers authorize and
26 permit all employees to take rest period means that employers must relieve employees of all duties
27 and relinquish control over how employees spend their time which includes control over the
28 locations where employees may take their rest period. Employers cannot impose controls that

1 prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk - five minutes out, five minutes back. Here,
2 DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members from
3 unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on DEFENDANT's rule which states PLAINTIFF and
4 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members cannot leave the work premises during their rest period.

5 13. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to accurately
6 record and pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the actual amount of
7 time these employees worked. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders,
8 DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all
9 time worked, meaning the time during which an employee was subject to the control of an
10 employer, including all the time the employee was permitted or suffered to permit this work.
11 DEFENDANT required these employees to work off the clock without paying them for all the time
12 they were under DEFENDANT's control. As such, DEFENDANT knew or should have known
13 that PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under compensated for
14 all time worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited
15 time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at
16 the applicable minimum wage and overtime wage rates. To the extent that the time worked off the
17 clock does not qualify for overtime premium payment, DEFENDANT fails to pay minimum wages
18 for the time worked off-the-clock in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

19 14. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other
20 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to
21 show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides
22 that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage
23 statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly
24 rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly
25 rate. PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the
26 wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours
27 worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor
28 Code Section 226(a). The wage statements DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFF and other

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage
2 statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period. When the hours
3 shown on the wage statements were added up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked
4 during the pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed
5 above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement
6 that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226. As a result, DEFENDANT from
7 time to time provided PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage
8 statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

9 15. DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
10 CLASS Members by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay in violation of Cal. Lab.
11 Code Section 246. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other non-exempt employees earn non-
12 discretionary remuneration. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate of pay, DEFENDANT
13 underpaid sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at their base rates of
14 pay.

15 16. Cal. Lab. Code Section 246(l)(2) requires that paid sick time for nonexempt
16 employees be calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium
17 pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of
18 employment.

19 17. DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 246 by failing to pay sick pay at the
20 regular rate of pay. PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members routinely earned non-
21 discretionary incentive wages which increased their regular rate of pay. However, when sick pay
22 was paid, it was paid at the base rate of pay for PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS, as opposed to the correct, higher regular rate of pay, as required under Cal. Lab. Code
24 Section 246.

25 18. As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANT regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFF and
26 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS their correct wages and accordingly owe waiting time
27 penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203. Further, PLAINTIFF is informed and believes
28 and based thereon alleges that such failure to pay sick pay at regular rate was willful, such that

1 PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS whose employment has separated are
2 entitled to waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201-203.

3 19. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 221, "It shall be unlawful for any employer to
4 collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said
5 employee." DEFENDANT failed to pay all compensation due to PLAINTIFF and other
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, made unlawful deductions from compensation
7 payable to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, failed to disclose all
8 aspects of the deductions from compensation payable to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR
9 SUB-CLASS Members, and thereby failed to pay these employees all wages due at each applicable
10 pay period and upon termination. PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
11 CLASS seek recovery of all illegal deductions from wages according to proof, related penalties,
12 interest, attorney fees and costs.

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

23 21. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 Members as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own personal cellular
25 phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for DEFENDANT but are
26 not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the cost associated with the use of their
27 personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT's benefit. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular

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

5 22. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, DEFENDANT failed to provide all the legally
6 required off-duty meal and rest breaks to PLAINTIFF as required by the applicable Wage Order and
7 Labor Code and failed to pay PLAINTIFF all minimum and overtime wages due to PLAINTIFF.
8 DEFENDANT did not have a policy or practice which provided timely off-duty meal and rest
9 breaks to PLAINTIFF and failed to compensate PLAINTIFF for PLAINTIFF's missed meal and
10 rest breaks. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF did not prevent PLAINTIFF from
11 being relieved of all of PLAINTIFF's duties for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a
12 result, DEFENDANT's failure to provide PLAINTIFF with the legally required meal periods is
13 evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF
14 individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

15 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

20 24. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
21 Sections 395 and 395.5, because PLAINTIFF worked in this County for DEFENDANT and
22 DEFENDANT (i) currently maintains and at all relevant times-maintained offices and facilities in
23 this County and/or conducts substantial business in this County, and (ii) committed the wrongful
24 conduct herein alleged in this County against members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

25 **THE CALIFORNIA CLASS**

26 25. PLAINTIFF brings the First Cause of Action for Unfair, Unlawful and Deceptive
27 Business Practices pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, (the "UCL") as a Class Action,
28 pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, on behalf of a California class, defined as all individuals

1 who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California, including any employees
2 staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees (the
3 “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing
4 of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS
5 PERIOD”). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS
6 Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

7 26. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS
8 against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

9 27. DEFENDANT, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in
10 violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order
11 requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and
12 willfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT failed to record all meal and rest breaks
13 missed by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, even though DEFENDANT
14 enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to
15 permit this work.

16 28. DEFENDANT has the legal burden to establish that each and every CALIFORNIA
17 CLASS Member was paid accurately for all meal and rest breaks missed as required by California
18 laws. The DEFENDANT, however, as a matter of policy and procedure failed to have in place
19 during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD and still fails to have in place a policy or practice to
20 ensure that each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member is paid as required by law. This
21 common business practice is applicable to each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member can be
22 adjudicated on a class-wide basis as unlawful, unfair, and/or deceptive under Cal. Business &
23 Professions Code §§ 17200, (the “UCL”) as causation, damages, and reliance are not elements of
24 this claim.

25 29. The CALIFORNIA CLASS, is so numerous that joinder of all CALIFORNIA
26 CLASS Members is impracticable.

27 30. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA CLASS under California
28 law by:

- a. Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of , Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, (the "UCL"), by unlawfully, unfairly and/or deceptively having in place company policies, practices and procedures that failed to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked, including minimum wages owed and overtime wages owed for work performed by these employees; and,
- b. Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the UCL, by failing to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

31. 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 CLASS are so numerous that the joinder of all such persons 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 CLASS will apply to every member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- c. The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims of each member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, was classified as a non-exempt employee paid on an hourly basis who was subjected to the DEFENDANT's deceptive practice and policy which failed to provide the legally required meal and rest periods to the CALIFORNIA CLASS and thereby underpaid compensation to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic injury as a result of DEFENDANT's employment practices. PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were and are similarly or identically harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive and unfair misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANT; and,

1 d. The representative PLAINTIFF 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 PLAINTIFF 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 32. 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
19 the 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 failed to pay all wages due to members of the CALIFORNIA
25 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 PLAINTIFF seeks declaratory relief holding

1 that the DEFENDANT's policy and practices constitute unfair
2 competition, along with declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and
3 incidental equitable relief as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the
4 conduct 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
9 available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy,
10 including consideration of:

- 11 i. The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in
12 individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions in
13 that the substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to
14 recover the relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the
15 individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members when compared to the
16 substantial 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 A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
20 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, which would establish
21 incompatible standards of conduct for the DEFENDANT; and/or,
22 B. 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
25 adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to
26 protect their interests;

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

1 legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANT, which may
2 adversely affect an individual's job with DEFENDANT or with a
3 subsequent employer, the Class Action is the only means to assert their
4 claims through 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
7 obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative litigation that is
8 likely to result in the absence of certification of this action pursuant to
9 Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

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

- 12 a. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS
13 predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA CLASS
14 Members because the DEFENDANT's employment practices are applied with
15 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
20 out of fear of retaliation or adverse impact on their employment;
- 21 c. The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that it is
22 impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS before the Court;
- 23 d. PLAINTIFF, 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
27 relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and other
28 improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and

injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted upon the CALIFORNIA CLASS;

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

34. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and identify by job title each of DEFENDANT's employees who have been intentionally subjected to DEFENDANT's company policy, practices and procedures as herein alleged. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the Complaint to include any additional job titles of similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

THE CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS

35. PLAINTIFF further brings the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth and Ninth causes Action on behalf of a California sub-class, defined as all members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California, including any employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and classified as non exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS") at any time during the period three (3) years prior to the filing of the complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD") pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382. The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is

1 under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

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

13 37. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and identify by
14 name and job title, each of DEFENDANT’s employees who have been intentionally subjected to
15 DEFENDANT’s company policy, practices and procedures as herein alleged. PLAINTIFF will
16 seek leave to amend the complaint to include any additional job titles of similarly situated
17 employees when they have been identified.

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

20 39. 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 DEFENDANT 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 California
25 regulations and the applicable California Wage Order;
- 26 b. Whether DEFENDANT failed to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of
27 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with accurate itemized wage statements;
- 28 c. Whether DEFENDANT has engaged in unfair competition by the above listed

1 conduct;

2 d. The proper measure of damages and penalties owed to the members of the

3 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; and,

4 e. Whether DEFENDANT's conduct was willful.

5 40. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS under

6 California law by:

7 a. Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 510, by failing to correctly pay the PLAINTIFF and the

8 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS all wages due for overtime

9 worked, for which DEFENDANT is liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 1194;

10 b. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1, by failing to accurately pay

11 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS the

12 correct minimum wage pay for which DEFENDANT is liable pursuant to Cal. Lab.

13 Code §§ 1194 and 1197;

14 c. Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 226, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and the members

15 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with an accurate itemized statement in

16 writing showing the corresponding correct amount of wages earned by the employee;

17 d. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and

18 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with all legally

19 required off-duty, uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal breaks and the legally

20 required off-duty rest breaks;

21 e. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and/or 203, which provides that when an

22 employee is discharged or quits from employment, the employer must pay the

23 employee all wages due without abatement, by failing to tender full payment and/or

24 restitution of wages owed or in the manner required by California law to the

25 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS who have terminated their

26 employment; and,

27 f. Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the

28 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members with necessary expenses incurred in

1 the discharge of their job duties.

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

- 4 a. The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so
5 numerous that the joinder of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is
6 impracticable and the disposition of their claims as a class will benefit the parties
7 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 LABOR SUB-CLASS
10 and will apply to every member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;
- 11 c. The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims of each
12 member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all the
13 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, was a non-exempt
14 employee paid on an hourly basis who was subjected to the DEFENDANT's
15 practice and policy which failed to pay the correct amount of wages due to the
16 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic injury as a
17 result of DEFENDANT's employment practices. PLAINTIFF and the members of
18 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were and are similarly or identically
19 harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive, and unfair misconduct engaged in by
20 DEFENDANT; and,
- 21 d. The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the
22 interest of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and has retained counsel who
23 are competent and experienced in Class Action litigation. There are no material
24 conflicts between the claims of the representative PLAINTIFF and the members of
25 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS that would make class certification
26 inappropriate. Counsel for the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS will
27 vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members.

28 42. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action is

1 properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 2 a. Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory
3 and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of separate actions by
4 individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS will create the risk
5 of:
 - 6 i. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of
7 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would establish
8 incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the
9 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; or,
 - 10 ii. Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA
11 LABOR SUB-CLASS which would as a practical matter be dispositive of
12 interests of the other members not party to the adjudication or substantially
13 impair or impede their ability to protect their interests.
- 14 b. The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have acted or
15 refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
16 CLASS, making appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the CALIFORNIA
17 LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole in that DEFENDANT fails to pay all wages due.
18 Including the correct wages for all time worked by the members of the
19 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as required by law;
- 20 c. Common questions of law and fact predominate as to the members of the
21 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, with respect to the practices and violations
22 of California Law as listed above, and predominate over any question affecting only
23 individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, and a Class Action is
24 superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the
25 controversy, including consideration of:
 - 26 i. The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS in
27 individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions in that
28 the substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to recover the

- 1 relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the individual
2 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members when compared to the
3 substantial expense and burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;
4 ii. Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation that
5 would create the risk of:
- 6 A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
7 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, which
8 would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the
9 DEFENDANT; and/or,
 - 10 B. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
11 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS would as a practical matter
12 be dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to
13 the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to
14 protect their interests;
- 15 iii. In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of individual
16 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid asserting their
17 legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANT, which may adversely
18 affect an individual's job with DEFENDANT or with a subsequent employer,
19 the Class Action is the only means to assert their claims through a
20 representative; and,
- 21 iv. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient
22 adjudication of this litigation because class treatment will obviate the need
23 for unduly and unnecessary duplicative litigation that is likely to result in the
24 absence of certification of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. §
25 382.

- 26 43. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant to
27 Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:
- 28 a. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS

predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members;

- b. A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS because in the context of employment litigation a substantial number of individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid asserting their rights individually out of fear of retaliation or adverse impact on their employment;
- c. The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS before the Court;
- d. PLAINTIFF, and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a Class Action;
- e. There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and other improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted upon the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;
- f. There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- g. DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, thereby making final class-wide relief appropriate with respect to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole;
- h. The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are readily ascertainable from the business records of DEFENDANT. The CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS consists of all CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who worked for DEFENDANT in California at any time during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-

1 CLASS PERIOD; and,

- 2 i. Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring a efficient
3 and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims arising out
4 of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
5 SUB-CLASS.

6 ///

7 ///

8 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **For Unlawful Business Practices**

10 **[Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code §§ 17200]**

11 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

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

15 45. DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. and Prof. Code §
16 17021.

17 46. California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, (the “UCL”) defines unfair
18 competition as any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice. Section 17203
19 authorizes injunctive, declaratory, and/or other equitable relief with respect to unfair competition as
20 follows:

21 Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition
22 may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court may make such
23 orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to
24 prevent the use or employment by any person of any practice which constitutes unfair
25 competition, as defined in this chapter, or as may be necessary to restore to any person
26 in interest any money or property, real or personal, which may have been acquired by
27 means of such unfair competition.

28 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203.

47. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to engage
in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the applicable
Industrial Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code

1 including Sections 221, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802 and the Fair Labor
2 Standards Act and federal regulations promulgated thereunder, for which this Court should issue
3 declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be
4 necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to constitute unfair competition, including
5 restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

11 49. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were deceptive and
12 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT's policy and practice failed to provide the legally mandated meal
13 and rest periods, the required amount of compensation for missed meal and rest periods and
14 overtime and minimum wages owed, failed to timely pay wages, and failed to reimburse all
15 necessary business expenses incurred, and failed to provide Fair Labor Standards Act overtime
16 wages due for overtime worked as a result of failing to include non-discretionary incentive
17 compensation into their regular rates of pay for purposes of computing the proper overtime pay due
18 to a business practice that cannot be justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and
19 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, and for
20 which this Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §
21 17203, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

26 51. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful, unfair
27 and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's policies, practices and procedures failed to provide all legally
28

1 required meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS as
2 required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

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

8 53. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of himself and each member of the
9 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off duty
10 paid rest period was not timely provided as required by law.

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **For Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

12 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 and 1197.1]**

13 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

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

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

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

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

26 63. DEFENDANT maintained a wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the other
27 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time
28 they work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT's policy and practice was to unlawfully and

1 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
2 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

3 64. DEFENDANT's unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without limitation,
4 applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result of implementing a
5 policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS in regards to minimum wage pay.

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

13 66. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
14 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS did not receive the
15 correct minimum wage compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANT.

16 67. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT
17 required, permitted or suffered PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members to
18 work without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. During the
19 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
20 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were paid less for time worked that they were entitled to,
21 constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

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

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

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

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

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

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

1 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **For Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

3 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 510]**

4 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

5 72. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS,
6 reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though full set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of
7 this Complaint.

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

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

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

21 76. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and
22 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB CLASS Members were required, permitted or suffered by
23 DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time they worked, including
24 overtime work.

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

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

4 78. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
5 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
6 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB CLASS Members. DEFENDANT acted in an
7 illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the
8 California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws
9 and regulations. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein, the
10 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS did not receive
11 full compensation for overtime worked.

12 79. 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 the PLAINTIFF
14 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. Further, PLAINTIFF and the
15 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were not subject to a valid collective
16 bargaining agreement that would preclude the causes of action contained herein this Complaint.
17 Rather, PLAINTIFF brings this Action on behalf of himself and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
18 CLASS based on DEFENDANT's violations of non-negotiable, non-waivable rights provided by
19 the State of California.

20 80. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the
21 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have been paid less for overtime
22 worked that they are entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

23 81. DEFENDANT failed to accurately pay the PLAINTIFF 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 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
27 were required to work, and did in fact work, overtime as to which DEFENDANT failed to
28

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

3 82. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
4 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
5 for the true amount of time they worked, PLAINTIFF 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 83. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
9 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were under compensated for all overtime
10 worked. DEFENDANT elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross nonfeasance, to not
11 pay employees for their labor as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and
12 DEFENDANT perpetrated this scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of
13 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for overtime worked.

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

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

1 Lab. Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA LABOR
2 SUB-CLASS Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not
3 in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members are
4 entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

5 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **For Failure to Provide Required Meal Periods**

7 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]**

8 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

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

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

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

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

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

For Failure to Provide Required Rest Periods

[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]

(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)

90. 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.

91. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were from time to time required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees from time to time were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were periodically denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

92. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS

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

4 93. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF 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 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **For Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

9 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 226]**

10 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

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

14 95. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with an
15 "accurate itemized" statement in writing showing:

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

96. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. 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. PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements were added up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226. As a result, DEFENDANT from time to time provided PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

97. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which

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

8 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **For Failure to Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses**

10 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 2802]**

11 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

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

15 99. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

16 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses
17 incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of
18 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.

19 100. At all relevant times herein, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 2802, by
20 failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
21 members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANT's
22 benefit. DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
23 CLASS members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to using their
24 personal cellular phones on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT. Specifically,
25 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were required by
26 DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular phones and home offices in order to perform work
27 related job tasks. DEFENDANT's policy and practice was to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and the
28 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for expenses resulting from using their personal

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

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

12 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **For Failure to Pay Wages When Due**

14 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202, 203]**

15 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

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

19 103. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides, in relevant part, that:

20 As used in this article:(a) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by employees
21 of every description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time,
22 task, piece, Commission basis, or other method of calculation.(b) "Labor" includes labor,
23 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.

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

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

27 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
28 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

1 quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.
2 Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a 72-
3 hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and
4 designates a mailing address. The date of the mailing shall constitute the date of payment for
5 purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of quitting.

6 106. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF's or any CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
7 CLASS Members' employment contract.

8 107. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

14 108. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
15 Members has terminated and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of all wages owed as
16 required by law. Additionally, at all times during the term of PLAINTIFF's employment with
17 DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members earned and
18 accrued vested vacation and holiday time on the date of their termination pursuant to
19 DEFENDANT's uniform vacation policies and applicable California law. The amount of vacation
20 pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members earned and
21 accumulated is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records. Additionally, DEFENDANT also
22 underpaid accrued vested vacation wages to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
23 CLASS MEMBERS by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay and more specifically
24 the final rate of pay that included all non-discretionary incentive compensation. Rather than pay
25 vacation wages at the regular rate of pay, DEFENDANT underpaid vacation wages to PLAINTIFF
26 and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members at their base rates of pay, instead of
27 including all of PLAINTIFF's and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members' non-
28 discretionary incentive compensation into the vacation wage payment calculations. DEFENDANT
failed to specify in DEFENDANT's written vacation policy the rate at which PLAINTIFF and other
CALIFORNIA LABOR CLASS Members would be paid vacation upon leaving employment with
DEFENDANT. As a result of DEFENDANT's unlawful practice, policy and procedure to deny

1 paying the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS all of
2 their vested vacation and holiday time, DEFENDANT failed to pay the PLAINTIFF and the
3 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS all vested vacation time as wages due upon
4 employment termination, in violation of the California Labor Code, Sections 201, 202, 203 and
5 227.3. Similarly, DEFENDANT underpaid waiting time penalties to PLAINTIFF and other
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members at their base rates of pay, instead of including all of
7 PLAINTIFF's and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members' non-discretionary
8 compensation into the waiting time penalty calculations. This failure by DEFENDANT is believed
9 to be the result of DEFENDANT's unlawful, unfair and deceptive refusal to provide compensation
10 for earned, accrued and vested vacation and holiday time, as well as the corresponding waiting time
11 penalties that were paid. DEFENDANT perpetrated this unlawful, unfair and deceptive practice to
12 the detriment of the PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS .
13 DEFENDANT's uniform practice and policy of failing to pay the LABOR SUB-CLASS Members
14 for all vested vacation and holiday time accumulated at employment termination violated and
15 continues to violate Section 227.3 of the California Labor Code.

16 109. Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of himself and the
17 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS whose employment has terminated and who
18 have not been fully paid their wages due to them, PLAINTIFF demands thirty days of pay as
19 penalty for not paying all wages due at time of termination for all employees who terminated
20 employment during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD and demands an accounting
21 and payment of all wages due, plus interest and statutory costs as allowed by law.

22 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **For Failure to Pay Sick Pay Wages**

24 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203, 233, 246]**

25 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

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

1 111. Cal Lab. Code § 233 provides that an employer must permit an employee to use
2 accrued sick leave in accordance with Cal Lab. Code § 246.5 at the employee's then current rate of
3 entitlement. Cal Lab. Code § 246 provides that an employee is entitled to sick pay wages for use of
4 accrued sick leave pursuant to Cal Lab. Code § 246.5. Specifically, once accrued sick leave is used
5 as paid sick time, an employee has a vested right to sick pay wages, which an employer must
6 calculate and compensate based on one of two calculations: (i) "Paid sick time for nonexempt
7 employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in
8 which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in
9 that workweek," or (ii) "Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated by dividing the
10 employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked
11 in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment." Under Cal Lab. Code §§ 218 and 233,
12 employees may sue to recover underpaid sick pay wages as damages.

13 112. As a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT pays sick pay wages to
14 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS at the incorrect
15 rate of pay. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS
16 regularly use accrued sick leave in the workweeks in which they also earn non-hourly remuneration.
17 As a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT pays sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and the other
18 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS at the base hourly pay, as opposed to the
19 regular rate of pay, which would consider all non-hourly remuneration in addition to base hourly
20 wages, or the rate resulting from dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime
21 premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of
22 employment. As a result, DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and the other
23 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS.

24 113. Cal. Lab. Code § 246 specifically requires that, upon use of accrued sick leave,
25 vested sick pay wages are due and to be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll
26 period after accrued sick leave is used as paid sick time. Similarly, Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides
27 that if an employer discharges an employee, wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are
28 due and payable immediately. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides that an employee is entitled to receive

1 all unpaid wages no later than 72 hours after an employee quits his or her employment, unless the
2 employee has given 72-hour notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is
3 entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. The Labor Code penalizes untimely payments.
4 For example, Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed in
5 accordance with Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a
6 penalty from the due date, and at the same rate until paid, but the wages shall not continue for more
7 than thirty (30) days. Under Cal. Lab. Code §§ 203 and 218, employees may sue to recover
8 applicable penalties.

9 114. As alleged herein and as a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT routinely
10 underpays sick pay wages and thus did not timely pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
11 CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS all owing and underpaid sick pay wages. As a result,
12 DEFENDANT violates Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203, 233, and 246, among other Labor Code
13 provisions. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes that DEFENDANT was advised by skilled
14 lawyers and knew, or should have known, of the mandates of the Labor Code as it relates to
15 PLAINTIFF's allegations, especially since the California Supreme Court has explained that
16 "[c]ourts have recognized that 'wages' also include those benefits to which an employee is entitled
17 as a part of his or her compensation, including money, room, board, clothing, vacation pay, and sick
18 pay." *Murphy v. Kenneth Cole Prods., Inc.*, 40 Cal. 4th 1094, 1103 (2007)(emphasis added).
19 Because DEFENDANT willfully fails to timely pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
20 CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS all sick pay wages due, DEFENDANT is subject to
21 applicable penalties.

22 115. Such a pattern, practice, and uniform administration of corporate policy is unlawful
23 and entitles PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS to
24 underpaid sick pay wages, including interest thereon, applicable penalties, attorney's fees, and costs
25 of suit.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **CIVIL PENALTIES**

3 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*]**

4 **[Against All Defendants]**

5 116. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

6 117. During the applicable limitations period, Defendants have violated Labor Code §§
7 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2802.

8 118. Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on behalf of
9 himself and other current and former employees, to bring a representative civil action to recover
10 civil penalties pursuant to the procedures set forth in Labor Code § 2699.3 that may, but need not,
11 be brought or maintained as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

12 119. Plaintiff, a former employee against whom Defendants committed one or more of the
13 alleged Labor Code violations during the applicable limitations period, is an aggrieved employee
14 within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699(c).

15 120. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
16 § 2699.3. Notice was provided to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency
17 (“LWDA”) and 65 days have elapsed without the LWDA providing Plaintiff with any notice of an
18 intent to investigate.

19 121. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff seeks the following civil
20 penalties for Defendants’ violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7,
21 227.3, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1198 and 2802:

22 i. For violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 212, 226.7, 227.3, 1194, 1198
23 and 2802, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee per pay period for
24 each initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee per
25 pay period for each subsequent violation (penalties set by Labor Code §
26 2699(f)(2));

27 ii. For violations of Labor Code § 203, a penalty in an amount not exceeding
28 thirty (30) days’ pay as waiting time (penalties set by Labor Code § 256);

- 1 iii. For violations of Labor Code § 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
2 employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional,
3 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus 25% of the amount
4 unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each initial violation that was
5 either willful or intentional, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each
6 employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld
7 from each employee, for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the
8 subsequent violation was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor
9 Code § 210);
- 10 iv. For violations of Labor Code § 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
11 employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional,
12 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent
13 (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each
14 initial violation that was either willful or intentional, and two hundred dollars
15 (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount
16 unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each subsequent violation,
17 regardless of whether the subsequent violation was either willful or
18 intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 225.5);
- 19 v. For violations of Labor Code § 226(a), if this action is deemed to be an initial
20 citation, two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each employee for each
21 violation. Alternatively, if an initial citation or its equivalent occurred before
22 the filing of this action, one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each employee for
23 each violation (penalties set by Labor Code § 226.3);
- 24 vi. For violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50) for each
25 employee for each initial pay period for which the employee was underpaid,
26 and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee for each subsequent pay
27 period for which the employee was underpaid (penalties set by Labor Code §
28 558);

vii. For violations of Labor Code § 1197, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1197 that was intentional and two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation of Labor Code § 1197, regardless of whether the initial violation was intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 1197.1);

Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g), Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with Plaintiff's claims for civil penalties.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, on behalf of himself, all other current and former non-exempt employees, and the general public, prays for judgment against each Defendant, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

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

- A. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- B. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory damages

1 for minimum and overtime compensation due PLAINTIFF and the other members of
2 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, during the applicable CALIFORNIA
3 LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;

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

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

11 E. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code Sections 1194.2 and
12 1197;

13 F. The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the CALIFORNIA
14 LABOR SUBCLASS incurred in the course of their job duties, plus interest, and
15 costs of suit.; and,

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

19 3. On all claims:

20 A. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;

21 B. Civil penalties;

22 C. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and,

23 D. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the law,
24 including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §221, §226, §1194, and/or
25 §2802.

1 Dated: September 14, 2026 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

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

/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw
Norman B. Blumenthal
Nicholas J. De Blouw

SETAREH LAW GROUP

/s/ Farrah Grant
Shaun Setareh
Thomas Segal
Farrah Grant

Attorneys for Plaintiff
LEONARDO CUERVO

[illegible]

Dated: September 14, 2026 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

SETAREH LAW GROUP

45

FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE-ACTION COMPLAINT