

SUMMONS
(CITACION JUDICIAL)

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

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:
(AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

AGEMARK MANAGEMENT LLC, a Wyoming limited liability company; (Additional Parties Attachment form is attached)

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:
(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

CHERI ANTOINETTE JORDAN, an individual, on behalf of Plaintiff, and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,

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

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

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. **NOTE:** The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. **¡AVISO!** Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.

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

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

The name and address of the court is:
(El nombre y dirección de la corte es): Contra Costa Superior Court
Wakefield Taylor Courthouse - 725 Court St, Martinez, CA 94553

CASE NUMBER:
(Número del Caso):

C25-03727

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:
(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):
Carolina Faccin, Esq. T: (619) 599-8292 JCL Law Firm, APC - 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600, San Diego, CA 92121

DATE: 12/19/2025 12:04 PM Clerk, by /s/ C. Padilla, Deputy
(Fecha) (Secretario) (Adjunto)

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

[SEAL]



NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

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

SHORT TITLE: Jordan v. Agemark Management LLC, et al.	CASE NUMBER: C25-03727
--	---------------------------

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

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

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

Plaintiff
 Defendant
 Cross-Complainant
 Cross-Defendant

REMARKABLE CAREGIVERS TCOC LLC, a Wyoming limited liability company; BULLARDS BAR LLC, a California limited liability company; KALESTA HEALTHCARE GROUP LLC, a California limited liability company; THREE ARCH LLC, a California limited liability company; STRANDS LLC, a California limited liability company; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
Sydney Castillo-Johnson (State Bar #343881)
Perssia Razma (State Bar #351398)
John L. Nitti (State Bar #330752)
Carolina Faccin (State Bar #340855)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
scastillo@jcl-lawfirm.com
prazma@jcl-lawfirm.com
jnitti@jcl-lawfirm.com
cfaccin@jcl-lawfirm.com

SUMMONS ISSUED

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
Jackland K Hom (State Bar #327243)
Jaclyn Joyce (State Bar #285124)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047
shani@zakaylaw.com
jackland@zakaylaw.com
jaclyn@zakaylaw.com

Per local Rule, This case is assigned to
Judge Reyes, Benjamin T, II, for all purposes.

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

CHERI ANTOINETTE JORDAN, an individual, on behalf of Plaintiff, and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,

Case No: C25-03727

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

Plaintiff,
v.

AGEMARK MANAGEMENT LLC, a Wyoming limited liability company; REMARKABLE CAREGIVERS TCOC LLC, a Wyoming limited liability company; BULLARDS BAR LLC, a California limited liability company; KALESTA HEALTHCARE GROUP LLC, a California limited liability company; THREE ARCH LLC, a California limited liability company; STRANDS LLC, a California limited liability company; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

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

- 6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
- 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
- 8) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF CHERI ANTOINETTE JORDAN (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of PLAINTIFF and all other similarly situated current and former employees, alleges on information and belief, except for their own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS

1. Defendant AGEMARK MANAGEMENT LLC (“Defendant Agemark”) is a Wyoming limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

2. Defendant REMARKABLE CAREGIVERS TCOC LLC (“Defendant Remarkable”) is a Wyoming limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

3. Defendant BULLARDS BAR LLC (“Defendant Bullards”) is a California limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

4. Defendant KALESTA HEALTHCARE GROUP LLC (“Defendant Kalesta”) is a California limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

5. Defendant THREE ARCH LLC (“Defendant Three Arch”) is a California limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

///

1 6. Defendant STRANDS LLC (“Defendant Strands”) is a California limited liability
2 company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial
3 and regular business throughout California.

4 7. PLAINTIFF alleges there has existed a unity of interest and ownership between
5 Defendant Agemark, Defendant Remarkable, Defendant Bullards, Defendant Kalesta, Defendant
6 Three Arch, and Defendant Strands such that any individuality and separateness between the
7 entities has ceased and all Defendants are referred to herein as “BULLARDS BAR”.

8 8. PLAINTIFF alleges that DOES 1-50 are the partners, agents, owners, or managers
9 of BULLARDS BAR at all relevant times. PLAINTIFF alleges there has existed a unity of interest
10 and ownership between Defendant Agemark, Defendant Remarkable, Defendant Bullards,
11 Defendant Kalesta, Defendant Three Arch, and Defendant Strands, such that any individuality and
12 separateness between the entities has ceased. Defendant Agemark, Defendant Remarkable,
13 Defendant Bullards, Defendant Kalesta, Defendant Three Arch, and Defendant Strands are
14 therefore alter egos of each other. Adherence to the fiction of the separate existence of BULLARDS
15 BAR would permit an abuse of the corporate privilege and would promote injustice by protecting
16 BULLARDS BAR from liability for the wrongful acts committed by them.

17 9. PLAINTIFF further alleges that BULLARDS BAR are the alter egos of each other
18 for the following reasons:

- 19 a. On the California Secretary of State’s website (<https://businesssearch.sos.ca.gov/>)
20 Defendant Agemark, Defendant Remarkable, Defendant Bullards, Defendant
21 Kalesta, Defendant Three Arch, and Defendant Strands have the same principal
22 address and/or entity address and/or mailing address and/or Agent for Service of
23 Process;
- 24 b. On information and belief Defendant Agemark, Defendant Remarkable, Defendant
25 Bullards, Defendant Kalesta, Defendant Three Arch, and Defendant Strands utilize
26 the same standardized employment forms and issue the same employment policies
27 and same pay stubs;

28 ///

1 c. On information and belief Defendant Agemark, Defendant Remarkable, Defendant
2 Bullards, Defendant Kalesta, Defendant Three Arch, and Defendant Strands have a
3 single executive team which supervised and managed the operations of all of
4 BULLARDS BAR' nursing facilities, supervised and managed the finances of all of
5 BULLARDS BAR' nursing facilities, supervised and managed the marketing of all
6 of BULLARDS BAR' nursing facilities, supervised and managed the human
7 resources of all of BULLARDS BAR' nursing facilities, and supervised and
8 managed the operations at all of BULLARDS BAR' nursing facilities.

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

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

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

18 13. Defendant Agemark, Defendant Remarkable, Defendant Bullards, Defendant
19 Kalesta, Defendant Three Arch, and Defendant Strands were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as
20 evidenced by the documents issued to PLAINTIFF, by the company PLAINTIFF performed work
21 for respectively, and as these entities each exerted control over the hours, wages and/or working
22 conditions of PLAINTIFF, and are therefore jointly responsible as employers for the conduct
23 alleged herein as "DEFENDANTS."

24 14. DEFENDANTS own and operate a nursing facility and operate in healthcare in
25 California, including in the County of Contra Costa, where PLAINTIFF worked.

26 15. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in California from March of 2023
27 to August of 2025, as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally
28

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

3 16. PLAINTIFF reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new
4 Plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v.*
5 *American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

6 17. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and a California
7 class, defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Agemark and/or
8 Defendant Remarkable and/or Defendant Bullards and/or Defendant Kalesta and/or Defendant
9 Three Arch and/or Defendant Strands in California and classified as non-exempt employees (the
10 "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing
11 of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD"). The
12 amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of the CALIFORNIA CLASS members is under five
13 million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

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

25 19. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
26 partnership, associate or otherwise of DEFENDANTS DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently
27 unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these DEFENDANTS by such fictitious names
28 pursuant to California Civil Procedure Code Section 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend

1 this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of DEFENDANTS DOES 1 through 50,
2 inclusive, when they are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that
3 information and belief alleges, that the DEFENDANTS named in this Complaint, including
4 DEFENDANTS DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of
5 the events and happenings that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

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

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

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

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

28 ///

1 other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay periods and the corresponding
2 amount of time worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANTS' uniform policies and practices are
3 intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment for all time worked as required by
4 California law which allows DEFENDANTS to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over
5 competitors who comply with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS, the CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted
7 accordingly.

8 **A. Meal Period Violations**

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

23 29. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work
24 schedules and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS members are from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off-duty
26 meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS members are required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for
28 more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further,

1 DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members with a second
2 off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees are required by DEFENDANTS
3 to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS members does not qualify for the limited and narrowly construed “on-duty”
5 meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call.
7 Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time required PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
8 members to maintain cordless communication devices in order to receive and respond to work-
9 related communications during what was supposed to be their off-duty meal breaks.
10 DEFENDANTS’ failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members with
11 legally required meal breaks is evidenced by DEFENDANTS’ business records. As a result of their
12 rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANTS’ inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF and other members
13 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in
14 accordance with DEFENDANTS’ strict corporate policy and practice.

15 **B. Rest Period Violations**

16 30. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without
18 being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and
19 DEFENDANTS’ inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons, these employees were denied
20 their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four
21 (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts
22 worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third rest
23 period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to
24 time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
25 members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and/or on call. Further,
26 DEFENDANTS from time to time required PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
27 members to maintain cordless communication devices in order to receive and respond to work-
28 related communications during what was supposed to be their off-duty rest breaks. PLAINTIFF

1 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were also not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu*
2 thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing,
3 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were from time to time denied their proper
4 rest periods by DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers.

5 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

17 32. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and other
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS members to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell
19 phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were required to use their personal cell phones, in order to
21 perform work related tasks. However, DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to reimburse
22 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members for the use of their personal cell phones.
23 As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANTS, the PLAINTIFF and other
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS members incurred unreimbursed business expenses that included, but were
25 not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cell phones, all on behalf of and for the
26 benefit of DEFENDANTS.

27
28 ///

1 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

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

18 35. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANTS, from time to time, failed to provide
19 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with
20 California Labor Code Section 226.

21 36. As a result, DEFENDANTS issued PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
22 members with wage statements that violate California Lab. Code § 226(a)(1)-(9). Further,
23 DEFENDANTS' violations are knowing and intentional, and were not isolated due to an
24 unintentional payroll error due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

25
26
27
28 ///

1 **E. Off-the-Clock Work Resulting in Minimum Wage, Overtime, and Double Time**
2 **Violations**

3 37. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS failed and
4 continues to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
5 for all hours worked.

6 38. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS required
7 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
8 work, including but not limited to sending and receiving work-related communications, clocking in
9 and out, and performing keyholder duties. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
10 CLASS members having to work while off-the-clock.

11 39. DEFENDANTS directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-
12 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

13 40. DEFENDANTS controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
14 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS
15 members.

16 41. DEFENDANTS were able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
17 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANTS failed to
18 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
19 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

20 42. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were non-exempt
21 employees, subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.

22 43. DEFENDANTS' policies and practices deprived PLAINTIFF and the other
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS members of all minimum regular, overtime, and double time wages owed
24 for the off-the-clock work activities. Because PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS typically worked over forty (40) hours in a workweek, and more than eight
26 (8) hours per day, DEFENDANTS' policies and practices also deprived them of overtime pay.
27 Because PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS worked in excess of 12
28 hours per day, DEFENDANTS' policies and practices also deprived them of double time pay. To

1 the extent applicable, DEFENDANTS’ also failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS at an overtime rate at one-and-one-half times their “regular rate of pay” for
3 the first eight hours of the seventh consecutive workday in a week and at a double time rate at two
4 times their “regular rate of pay” for hours worked over eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive
5 workday.

6 44. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFFS’ and the other
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS members’ off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

8 45. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
9 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS’ direction, control, and benefit
10 for the time spent working while off-the-clock, including but not limited to, sending and receiving
11 work-related communications and performing keyholder duties. DEFENDANTS’ uniform policy
12 and practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all
13 hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS’ business records.

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

16 46. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed and
17 continues to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS
18 members for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and
19 redeemed sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members
20 forfeited wages due to them for working overtime and double time without compensation at the
21 correct overtime and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay
22 rates. DEFENDANTS’ uniform policy and practice not to pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS members
23 at the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and
24 sick pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS’ business records.

25 47. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times
26 their “regular rate of pay” for all hours worked in excess for eight (8) hours. Further, California law
27 provides that employees must be paid double time at two times their “regular rate of pay” for all
28 hours worked over twelve (12) hours. State law further provides employees must be paid at an

1 overtime rate of one-and-one-half times their “regular rate of pay” for the first eight hours of the
2 seventh consecutive workday in a week and at a double time rate at two times their “regular rate of
3 pay” for hours worked over eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive workday. PLAINTIFF and
4 other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that
5 was tied to specific elements of an employee’s performance.

6 48. The second component of PLAINTIFF’S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
7 members’ compensation was DEFENDANTS’ non-discretionary incentive program that paid
8 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members incentive wages based on their
9 performance for DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees
10 paid on an hourly basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance
11 goals set by DEFENDANTS.

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

1 underpayment of which is recoverable under California Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203, and/or
2 204.

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

12 **G. Unlawful Deductions**

13 51. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, unlawfully deducted wages from
14 PLAINTIFF’S and CALIFORNIA CLASS members’ pay without explanations and without
15 authorization to do so or notice to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members. As a
16 result, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code Section 221.

17 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

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

27 53. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, from
28 time to time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and

1 without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

2 54. The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed DEFENDANTS to alter
3 employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in DEFENDANTS'
4 timekeeping system to create the appearance that PLAINTIFF and other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal breaks when, in fact, the employees
6 were not provided an off-duty meal break at all times. This practice is a direct result of
7 DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30)
8 minute off-duty meal breaks each day or otherwise failing to compensate them for missed meal
9 breaks.

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

15 **I. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

16 56. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS did not have in place
17 an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS members for the actual time these employees worked each day, including
19 overtime hours. Specifically, DEFENDANTS had in place an unlawful rounding policy and
20 practice that resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members being
21 undercompensated for all their time worked. As a result, DEFENDANTS were able to and did in
22 fact unlawfully and unilaterally round the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system
23 for PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these
24 employees for all their time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for overtime
25 worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time,
26 forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being accurately
27 recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

28 ///

1 57. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system and unlawful
2 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members' time
3 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANTS' unlawful rounding
4 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members to perform work as
5 ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-
6 duty meal break.

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

8 58. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 204, PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA
9 CLASS members were entitled to timely payment of wages during their employment. PLAINTIFF
10 and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time, did not receive payment of all wages,
11 including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period premium wages, and
12 rest period premium wages within the permissible time period.

13 59. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 201, "If an employer discharges an
14 employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately."
15 Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 202, if an employee quits his or her employment, "his
16 or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee
17 has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is
18 entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting." PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
19 members were, from time to time, not timely provided the wages earned and unpaid at the time of
20 their discharge and/or at the time of quitting, in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201
21 and 202.

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

25 **K. Sick Pay Violations**

26 61. California Labor Code Section 246 (a)(1) mandates that "An employee who, on or
27 after July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year
28 from the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days as specified in this section."

1 Further, California Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements.
2 From time to time, DEFENDANTS failed to have a policy or practice in place to provide
3 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with sick days and/or paid sick
4 leave. As of January 1, 2024, DEFENDANTS failed to adhere to the law in that they failed to
5 provide and allow employees to use at least 40 hours or five days of paid sick leave per year.

6 62. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its employees
7 with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available. From time to
8 time, DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section 246 by failing to furnish PLAINTIFF
9 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements setting forth the amount of
10 paid sick leave available.

11 CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

12 63. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF, and a California
13 class defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Agemark and/or
14 Defendant Remarkable and/or Defendant Bullards and/or Defendant Kalesta and/or Defendant
15 Three Arch and/or Defendant Strands in California and classified as non-exempt employees (the
16 "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing
17 of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD").

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

25 65. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
26 impractical.

27 66. Common questions of law and fact regarding DEFENDANTS' conduct, including
28 but not limited to, off-the-clock work, unpaid meal and rest period premiums, failure to accurately

1 calculate the regular rate of pay for overtime compensation, failure to accurately calculate the
2 regular rate of compensation for missed meal and rest period premiums, failure to provide legally
3 compliant meal and rest periods, failure to reimburse for business expenses, failure to provide
4 accurate itemized wage statements, and failure to ensure they are paid at least minimum wage and
5 overtime, exist as to all members of the class and predominate over any questions affecting solely
6 any individual members of the class. Among the questions of law and fact common to the class are:

- 7 a. Whether DEFENDANTS maintained legally compliant meal period policies and
8 practices;
- 9 b. Whether DEFENDANTS maintained legally compliant rest period policies and
10 practices;
- 11 c. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
12 members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
- 13 d. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
14 members accurate overtime and double time wages;
- 15 e. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
16 members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
- 17 f. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA
18 CLASS members for required business expenses;
- 19 g. Whether DEFENDANTS issued legally compliant wage statements;
- 20 h. Whether DEFENDANTS committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
21 failing to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
22 CLASS for all time worked;
- 23 i. Whether DEFENDANTS committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
24 failing to record all meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and other
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS members, even though DEFENDANTS enjoyed the benefit
26 of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to
27 permit this work;

28 ///

1 j. Whether DEFENDANTS committed an act of unfair competition in violation of
2 California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”), by
3 failing to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

5 67. PLAINTIFF is a member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as a
6 result of DEFENDANTS’ conduct and actions alleged herein.

7 68. PLAINTIFFS’ claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and
8 PLAINTIFF has the same interests as the other members of the class.

9 69. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

11 70. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action
12 litigation.

13 71. Further, PLAINTIFF’S interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the
14 interest of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

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

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

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

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

8 75. Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring an
9 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims arising out of the
10 conduct of DEFENDANTS.

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **Unlawful Business Practices**

13 **(Cal. Bus. and Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)**

14 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS)**

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

18 77. DEFENDANTS are each a “person” as that term is defined under California
19 Business and Professions Code Section 17021.

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

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

28 ///

1 79. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS have engaged and continues to
2 engage in business practices which violate California law, including but not limited to, the
3 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
4 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and
5 2802, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to California
6 Business and Professions Code Section 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the
7 conduct held to constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

13 81. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were deceptive and
14 fraudulent in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice failed to provide the legally
15 mandated meal and rest periods and the required amount of compensation for missed meal and rest
16 periods, failed to pay minimum, overtime, and double time wages owed, and failed to reimburse all
17 necessary business expenses incurred, due to a systematic business practice that cannot be justified,
18 pursuant to the applicable California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements
19 in violation of California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this
20 Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to California Business and Professions
21 Code Section 17203, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

26 83. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were also unfair and
27 deceptive in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
28

1 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members as
2 required by California Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512.

3 84. Therefore, PLAINTIFF demands on behalf of PLAINTIFF 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
7 of work.

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

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

17 87. 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 California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*

22 88. 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 DEFENDANTS have acquired, or of which PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been deprived, by means of the above described unlawful and unfair
26 business practices, including earned but unpaid wages for all time worked.

27 89. 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 95. DEFENDANTS maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the
2 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time they
3 work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and
4 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

25
26
27
28 ///

1 110. DEFENDANTS' uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
2 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of implementing
3 a uniform policy and practice that failed to accurately record overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and
4 other CALIFORNIA CLASS members and denied accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF and the
5 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked, including, the overtime work
6 performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or
7 forty (40) hours in any workweek.

8 111. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANTS
9 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
10 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members. DEFENDANTS acted in an illegal
11 attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California
12 Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and
13 regulations.

14 112. As a direct result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
15 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive the correct
16 overtime compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANTS.

17 113. California Labor Code Section 515 sets out various categories of employees who are
18 exempt from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to
19 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Further, PLAINTIFF and the
20 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are not subject to a valid collective bargaining
21 agreement that would preclude the causes of action contained herein this Complaint. Rather,
22 PLAINTIFF brings this Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS based on
23 DEFENDANTS' violations of non-negotiable, non-waivable rights provided by the State of
24 California.

25 114. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for overtime worked than they were entitled to, constituting
27 a failure to pay all earned wages.

28 ///

1 115. DEFENDANTS failed to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which was in excess of the
3 maximum hours permissible by law as required by California Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, and
4 1198, even though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were
5 regularly required to work, and did in fact work overtime, and did in fact work overtime as to which
6 DEFENDANTS failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business
7 records and witnessed by employees.

8 116. By virtue of DEFENDANTS' unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
9 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the true
10 amount of overtime they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
11 CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are presently
12 unknown to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

13 117. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
14 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were undercompensated for their time worked.
15 DEFENDANTS systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
16 nonfeasance, to not pay them for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice and
17 procedure, and DEFENDANTS perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF
18 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct overtime wages for their overtime
19 worked.

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

28 ///

1 DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of
2 the CALIFORNIA CLASS forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation and in
3 accordance with DEFENDANTS' strict corporate policy and practice.

4 122. DEFENDANTS further violated California Labor Code Section 226.7 and the
5 applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
6 members who were not provided a meal period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, one
7 additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that a
8 meal period was not provided.

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

12 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

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

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

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

19 125. From time to time, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were
20 required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods.
21 Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some
22 shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10)
23 minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third
24 rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more. PLAINTIFF
25 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were also not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu*
26 thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
27 members were periodically denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANTS and
28 DEFENDANTS' managers. In addition, DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and

1 other CALIFORNIA CLASS members for their rest periods as required by the applicable Wage
2 Order and Labor Code. As a result, DEFENDANTS' failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS members with all the legally required paid rest periods is evidenced by
4 DEFENDANTS' business records.

5 126. DEFENDANTS further violated California Labor Code Sections 226.7 and the
6 applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
7 members who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, one
8 additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that rest
9 period was not provided.

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

13 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

15 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

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

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

20 129. California Labor Code Section 226 provides that an employer must furnish
21 employees with an "accurate itemized" statement in writing showing:

- 22 a. Gross wages earned,
- 23 b. total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation
24 is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under
25 subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare
26 Commission,
- 27 c. the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
28 is paid on a piece-rate basis,

- d. all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item,
- e. net wages earned,
- f. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
- g. the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number of an employee identification number other than social security number may be shown on the itemized statement,
- h. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
- i. all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

130. When DEFENDANTS did not accurately record PLAINTIFFS' and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members' missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurate missed meal and rest break premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section 226 in that DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the accurate gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate, and correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods.

131. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANTS failed to provide itemized wage statements to PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that complied with the requirements of California Labor Code Section 226(a)(1)-(9).

132. DEFENDANTS knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with California Labor Code Section 226(a)(1)-(9), causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult

1 to estimate. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS may elect
2 to recover liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the
3 violation occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period
4 pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial
5 (but in no event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective
6 member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

7 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

9 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

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

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

14 134. California Labor Code Section 200 provides that:

15 As used in this article:

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

22 135. California Labor Code Section 201 provides, in relevant part, that "If an employer
23 discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable
24 immediately."

25 136. California Labor Code Section 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties
2 for DEFENDANTS' benefit. DEFENDANTS failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, the use of
4 their personal cell phones, all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANTS. Specifically,
5 DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members to use their
6 personal cell phones, to execute their essential job duties on behalf of DEFENDANTS.
7 DEFENDANTS' uniform policy, practice and procedure was to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and
8 the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for expenses resulting from the use of their personal cell
9 phones, within the course and scope of their employment for DEFENDANTS. These expenses
10 were necessary to complete their principal job duties. DEFENDANTS are estopped by
11 DEFENDANTS' conduct to assert any waiver of this expectation. Although these expenses were
12 necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members,
13 DEFENDANTS failed to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
14 members for these expenses as an employer is required to do under the laws and regulations of
15 California.

16 144. PLAINTIFF therefore demands reimbursement for expenditures or losses incurred
17 by them and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members in the discharge of their job duties for
18 DEFENDANTS, or their obedience to the directions of DEFENDANTS, with interest at the
19 statutory rate and costs under California Labor Code Section 2802.

20 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

21 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for a judgment against all DEFENDANTS, jointly and
22 severally, as follows:

23 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 24 a. That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA
25 CLASS as a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382;
26 b. An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining
27 DEFENDANTS from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;
28 c. An order requiring DEFENDANTS to pay all overtime and double time wages and

1 all sums unlawfully withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other
2 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and

3 d. Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANTS' ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund
4 for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANTS' violations due to
5 PLAINTIFF and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

6 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

7 a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth
8 Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant
9 to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382;

10 b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory
11 damages for overtime and double time compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the
12 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS
13 PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;

14 c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to California Labor Code Sections
15 226.7, 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;

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

21 e. The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a
22 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action
23 therefore is commenced, in accordance with California Labor Code Section 203.

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

26 3. On all claims:

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

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

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

c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law, including and pursuant to, but not limited to, California Labor Code Sections 218.5, 226, 246 and/or 1194.

DATED: December 19, 2025

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

By: Carolina Faccin
Carolina Faccin, Esq.
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: December 19, 2025

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

By: Carolina Faccin
Carolina Faccin, Esq.
Attorney for PLAINTIFF