

SUMMONS

(CITACION JUDICIAL)

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

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego
12/5/2025 9:19:10 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By N. Miller, Deputy Clerk

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

HYATT CORPORATION dba THE SEABIRD – A DESTINATION HOTEL, a Delaware corporation;
(Additional Parties Attachment Form is attached)

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

JOSH MONTES 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): San Diego Superior Court - North County

North County Courthouse - 325 South Melrose Drive, Vista, CA 92081

CASE NUMBER:
(Número del Caso):

25CU065911N

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):

Shani O. Zakay, Esq. T: (619) 255-9047 Zakay Law Group, APLC - 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600, San Diego, CA 92121

DATE:

(Fecha) December 11, 2025

Clerk, by

(Secretario)

N. Miller

, Deputy

(Adjunto)

N. Miller

(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):

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC
Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
shani@zakaylaw.com
Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
jackland@zakaylaw.com
Jennifer Gerstenzang (State Bar #279810)
jenny@zakaylaw.com
Nicole Noursamadi (State Bar #357246)
nicole@zakaylaw.com
Eden Zakay (State Bar #339536)
eden@zakaylaw.com
Jaclyn Joyce (State Bar #285124)
jaclyn@zakaylaw.com
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

JOSH MONTES an individual, on behalf of
Plaintiff, and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

HYATT CORPORATION dba THE SEABIRD
– A DESTINATION HOTEL, a Delaware
corporation; OCEANSIDE BEACH RESORT
OWNER, LLC, a Delaware limited liability
company; S.D. MALKIN PROPERTIES, INC.,
a Delaware corporation; S.D. MALKIN
OCEANSIDE, LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company; DH2 HOLDING LLC dba
MISSION PACIFIC HOTEL, a Delaware
limited liability company; and DOES 1-50,
Inclusive,

Defendants.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

12/5/2025 9:19:10 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By N. Miller ,Deputy Clerk

Case No: 25CU065911N

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

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

- 1 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN
2 DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB.
3 CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
4 8) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES
5 FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN
6 VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
7 9) FAILURE TO PERMIT INSPECTION OF
8 EMPLOYEE RECORDS IN VIOLATION
9 OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226, 432 1198.5
10 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE
11 ORDER;
12 10) FAILURE TO PROVIDE GRATUITIES
13 IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §
14 351.

15 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

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

19 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

20 1. Defendant HYATT CORPORATION dba THE SEABIRD – A DESTINATION
21 HOTEL (“Defendant Hyatt Corporation”) is a Delaware corporation that at all relevant times
22 mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout
23 California.

24 2. Defendant OCEANSIDE BEACH RESORT OWNER, LLC (“Defendant Oceanside
25 Beach Resort Owner”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned
26 herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

27 3. Defendant S.D. MALKIN PROPERTIES, INC. (“Defendant S.D. Malkin
28 Properties”) is a Delaware corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and
continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

4. Defendant S.D. MALKIN OCEANSIDE, LLC (“Defendant S.D. Malkin
Oceanside”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein
conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

1 5. Defendant DH2 HOLDING LLC dba MISSION PACIFIC HOTEL (“Defendant
2 DH2 Holding”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein
3 conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

4 6. Defendant Hyatt Corporation, Defendant Oceanside Beach Resort Owner,
5 Defendant S.D. Malkin Properties, Defendant S.D. Malkin Oceanside, and Defendant DH2 Holding
6 were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the documents issued to PLAINTIFF, by
7 the company PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively, and as these entities each exerted
8 control over the hours, wages and/or working conditions of PLAINTIFF, and are therefore jointly
9 responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein as “DEFENDANTS.”

10 7. DEFENDANTS own and operate hotels in California, including in the County of
11 San Diego, where PLAINTIFF worked.

12 8. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in California from May of 2022 to
13 December of 2024, as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally
14 required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time
15 worked.

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

19 10. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and a California
20 class, defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Hyatt Corporation
21 and/or Defendant Oceanside Beach Resort Owner and/or Defendant S.D. Malkin Properties and/or
22 Defendant S.D. Malkin Oceanside and/or Defendant DH2 Holding in California and classified as
23 non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period beginning four
24 (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court
25 (the “CLASS PERIOD”). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of the CALIFORNIA
26 CLASS members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

27 11. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and a
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

17 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

18 18. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil
19 Procedure Section 410.10 and California Business and Professions Code Section 17203. This action
20 is brought as a Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and similarly situated employees of
21 DEFENDANTS pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382.

22 19. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
23 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANTS operate in locations across California, employ
24 the CALIFORNIA CLASS across California, including in this county, and committed the wrongful
25 conduct herein alleged in this county against the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

26 **THE CONDUCT**

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

1 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically
2 failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate
3 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for missed meal and rest periods,
4 failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked,
5 failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for off-the-
6 clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
7 overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members
8 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS meal and rest premiums at the regular rate of pay, failed to pay
9 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS redeemed sick pay at the regular
10 rate of pay, failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
11 for business expenses, and failed to issue to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
12 CALIFORNIA CLASS with accurate itemized wage statements showing, among other things, all
13 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay periods and the corresponding amount of time
14 worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANTS' uniform policies and practices are intended to
15 purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment for all time worked as required by California law
16 which allows DEFENDANTS to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who
17 comply with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA
18 CLASS against DEFENDANTS, the CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

19 **A. Meal Period Violations**

20 21. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANTS were
21 required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members for all their time worked,
22 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all
23 the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the CLASS
24 PERIOD, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members to work
25 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANTS' control. Specifically,
26 DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be
27 PLAINTIFFS' off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not even
28 receive a partial lunch. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members

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

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

25 **B. Rest Period Violations**

26 23. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without
28 being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and

1 DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons, these employees were denied
2 their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four
3 (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts
4 worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third rest
5 period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to
6 time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
7 members were, from time to time, required to remain on premises, on duty and/or on call. Further,
8 DEFENDANTS from time to time required PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
9 members to maintain cordless communication devices in order to receive and respond to work-
10 related communications during what was supposed to be their off-duty rest breaks. PLAINTIFF
11 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were also not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu*
12 thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing,
13 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were from time to time denied their proper
14 rest periods by DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers.

15 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

27 25. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and other
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS members to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell

1 phones and personal vehicles, as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties. Specifically,
2 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were required to use their personal cell
3 phones and personal vehicles, in order to perform work related tasks. However, DEFENDANTS
4 unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members for the use
5 of their personal cell phones and personal vehicles. As a result, in the course of their employment
6 with DEFENDANTS, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members incurred
7 unreimbursed business expenses that included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of
8 their personal cell phones and personal vehicles, all on behalf of and for the benefit of
9 DEFENDANTS.

10 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

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

27
28 ///

1 28. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANTS, from time to time, failed to provide
2 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with
3 California Labor Code Section 226.

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

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

9 30. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS failed and
10 continues to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
11 for all hours worked.

12 31. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS required
13 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
14 work, including but not limited to, sending and receiving work-related communications. This
15 resulted in PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members having to work while off-the-
16 clock.

17 32. DEFENDANTS directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-
18 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

19 33. DEFENDANTS controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
20 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS
21 members.

22 34. DEFENDANTS were able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
23 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANTS failed to
24 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
25 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

26 35. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were non-exempt
27 employees, subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.

28 ///

1 36. DEFENDANTS’ policies and practices deprived PLAINTIFF and the other
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS members of all minimum regular, overtime, and double time wages owed
3 for the off-the-clock work activities. Because PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS typically worked over forty (40) hours in a workweek, and more than eight
5 (8) hours per day, DEFENDANTS’ policies and practices also deprived them of overtime pay.

6 37. 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 38. 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. DEFENDANTS’ uniform policy and practice to not pay
12 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all hours worked in
13 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 39. 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 without compensation at the correct overtime
21 and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates.
22 DEFENDANTS’ uniform policy and practice not to pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS members at
23 the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick
24 pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS’ business records.

25 40. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times
26 their “regular rate of pay.” PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were
27 compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an employee’s
28 performance.

1 41. The second component of PLAINTIFF’S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
2 members’ compensation was DEFENDANTS’ non-discretionary incentive program that paid
3 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members incentive wages based on their
4 performance for DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees
5 paid on an hourly basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance
6 goals set by DEFENDANTS.

7 42. However, from time to time, when calculating the regular rate of pay in those pay
8 periods where PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members worked overtime, double
9 time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-
10 discretionary bonuses, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus
11 compensation as part of the employee’s “regular rate of pay” and/or calculated all hours worked
12 rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the
13 incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package. As
14 a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
15 CLASS members must be included in the “regular rate of pay.” The failure to do so has resulted in
16 a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period
17 premium payments, and redeemed sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
18 members by DEFENDANTS. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid
19 sick time for non-exempt employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of
20 pay for the workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the
21 employee actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANTS’ conduct, as articulated
22 herein, by failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the “regular rate of pay” for
23 purposes of sick pay compensation was in violation of California Labor Code Section 246, the
24 underpayment of which is recoverable under California Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203, and/or
25 204.

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

1 compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS at the correct rate
2 of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick
3 pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANTS to illegally profit and gain an
4 unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable tolling
5 operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS members against DEFENDANTS, the CLASS
6 PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

7 **G. Unlawful Deductions**

8 44. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, unlawfully deducted wages from
9 PLAINTIFF'S and CALIFORNIA CLASS members' pay without explanations and without
10 authorization to do so or notice to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members. As a
11 result, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code Section 221.

12 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

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

22 46. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, from
23 time to time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and
24 without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

25 47. The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed DEFENDANTS to alter
26 employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in DEFENDANTS'
27 timekeeping system to create the appearance that PLAINTIFF and other members of the
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal breaks when, in fact, the employees

1 were not provided an off-duty meal break at all times. This practice is a direct result of
2 DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30)
3 minute off-duty meal breaks each day or otherwise failing to compensate them for missed meal
4 breaks.

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

10 **I. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

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

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

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

2 51. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 204, PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA
3 CLASS members were entitled to timely payment of wages during their employment. PLAINTIFF
4 and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time, did not receive payment of all wages,
5 including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period premium wages, and
6 rest period premium wages within the permissible time period.

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

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

19 **K. Sick Pay Violations**

20 54. California Labor Code Section 246 (a)(1) mandates that “An employee who, on or
21 after July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year
22 from the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days as specified in this section.”
23 Further, California Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements.
24 From time to time, DEFENDANTS failed to have a policy or practice in place to provide
25 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with sick days and/or paid sick
26 leave. As of January 1, 2024, DEFENDANTS failed to adhere to the law in that they failed to
27 provide and allow employees to use at least 40 hours or five days of paid sick leave per year.

28 55. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its employees

1 with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available. From time to
2 time, DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section 246 by failing to furnish PLAINTIFF
3 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements setting forth the amount of
4 paid sick leave available.

5 **L. Reporting Time Violations**

6 56. Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time required PLAINTIFF and other
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to report to work, but were furnished less than half their
8 scheduled shift's worth of work and were not paid reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code
9 Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subdivision(A). Specifically, Subdivision 5(A) states, "(A) Each workday an
10 employee is required to report for work and does report, but is not put to work or is furnished less
11 than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work, the employee shall be paid for half the
12 usual or scheduled day's work, but in no event for less than two (2) hours nor more than four (4)
13 hours, at the employee's regular rate of pay, which shall not be less than the minimum wage." In
14 addition, when DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
15 to engage in additional work, this sometimes resulted in a second reporting for work in a single
16 workday. In such a circumstance of a second reporting for work in a single workday,
17 DEFENDANTS failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs.,
18 tit. 8 § 11040. Subdivision 5(B) states: "If an employee is required to report for work a second time
19 in any one workday and is furnished less than two (2) hours of work on the second reporting, said
20 employee shall be paid for two (2) hours at the employee's regular rate of pay, which shall be not
21 less than the minimum wage." Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(B).

22 **M. Tip Pooling**

23 57. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS period, pursuant to DEFENDANTS' company
24 policies and practices, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were forced to
25 forfeit gratuities left for them by customers to DEFENDANTS' agents who provided no service
26 to the customers that resulted in the gratuity. DEFENDANTS routinely added gratuity tips and
27 service charges to its food and beverage bills. These gratuities and service charges reasonably
28 appear to be gratuities for the service staff. It is typical and customary in the hospitality industry

1 that establishments impose gratuity charges on the food and beverage bill. Thus, when customers
2 paid these charges, it is reasonable for them to have believed they were gratuities to be paid to the
3 service staff. Indeed, because many of these charges are depicted to customers, and the custom in
4 the food and beverage industry that gratuities are paid for food and beverage service, customers
5 paid these charges reasonably believing they were remitted to the service staff. However,
6 DEFENDANTS have not remitted the total proceeds of these gratuities to the non-managerial
7 employees who serve the food and beverages. Instead, DEFENDANTS have a policy and practice
8 of using a portion of these gratuities to pay managers or other non-service employees. As a result,
9 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have not received the total proceeds of the
10 gratuities, to which they are entitled to under California law.

11 58. DEFENDANTS are generally in the business of owning and operating a restaurant.
12 During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
13 Members were in the “chain of service” and earned gratuities based on their service for their
14 customers. However, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were forced to forfeit
15 portions of their gratuities, which said gratuities were kept by DEFENDANTS’ employees who
16 were not in the chain of service from which the gratuity resulted. PLAINTIFF and other
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members contend that any gratuities kept by DEFENDANTS’ non-
18 service employees were illegal and in violation of California law because PLAINTIFF and other
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members provided the service for to whom the gratuity should have been
20 paid.

21 59. California Labor Code § 351 establishes the requirements for an employer
22 regarding the payment of gratuities. Specifically, gratuities are the sole property of the employees.
23 California Labor Code § 351 expressly prohibits employers and their agents from collecting,
24 taking, or receiving any portion of a gratuity. California Labor Code § 350(e) defines the term
25 “gratuity” as including any money that has been paid or given or left for an employee by a patron
26 of a business over and above the actual amount due the business for services rendered or for
27 goods, food, drink or articles sold or served to such patron. Labor Code § 353 requires employers
28 to keep accurate records of all gratuities they receive, directly or indirectly.

1 60. Although tip pooling is not expressly prohibited by the Labor Code, employees
2 who mandate tip pooling must only distribute pooled tips to employees in the “chain of service.”
3 By distributing tips to employees who were not in the “chain of service,” DEFENDANTS have
4 violated and continue to violate the legal requirements for handling pooled tips.

5 **N. Failure to Provide Personnel Files**

6 61. On January 22, 2025, PLAINTIFF caused a written request via certified mail to be
7 delivered to DEFENDANTS for PLAINTIFF’S personnel and employment records, including but
8 not limited to: (1) payroll records; (2) employment contracts; (3) itemized pay stubs; (4) time
9 records; and (5) PLAINTIFF’S complete employment file.

10 62. DEFENDANTS failed to provide and/or make available to PLAINTIFF their
11 personnel records, payroll records, time records, employment contract, and entire employment file
12 within thirty (30) days of their request stated above. In fact, as of the date of filing of this complaint,
13 DEFENDANTS have still failed to pay PLAINTIFF the statutory penalty in the amount of \$750
14 pursuant to California Labor Code Sections 226 and 1198.5. DEFENDANTS violated California
15 Labor Code Sections 226, 432, and 1198.5 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to
16 respond and provide PLAINTIFF with their employment file. Labor Code Section 226(b) requires
17 employers to make payroll records available to employees upon reasonable request. Labor Code
18 Section 226(c) further requires that the employer comply with the request for records as soon as
19 practicable, but no later than twenty-one (21) calendar days from the date of request. Labor Code
20 Section 226(f) entitles employees to recover civil penalties of \$750 against an employer who
21 violates these requirements. Labor Code Section 432 also entitles an employee to receive copies of
22 any signed documents related to the obtaining or holding of employment. Finally, pursuant to the
23 applicable Industrial Welfare Commission wage orders, DEFENDANTS are required to maintain
24 accurate records for employees, including time records, and such records must be made readily
25 available for inspection by the employee upon a reasonable request. Section 1198.5 states that
26 employees (and former employees) have the right to inspect personnel records maintained by the
27 employer “related to the employee’s performance or to any grievance concerning the employee.”
28 Employers must allow inspection or copying within thirty (30) days of the request. As a result,
PLAINTIFF is now entitled to and requests injunctive relief to obtain compliance with California

1 Labor Code Sections 226, 432, 1198.5 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and applicable
2 statutory penalties and an award of attorneys' fees and costs for bringing this action.

3 63. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
4 off-duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for their rest and meal periods.
5 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5)
6 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to
7 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which they were required
8 by DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANTS provided PLAINTIFF
9 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on premises, on-duty and on-call for the
10 rest break. DEFENDANTS' policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on premises, on-call and on-
11 duty during what was supposed to be their off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited
12 meal and rest breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS'
13 strict corporate policy and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANTS also provided PLAINTIFF with
14 paystubs that failed to comply with California Labor Code Section 226. Further, DEFENDANTS
15 also failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF for required business expenses related to the personal
16 expenses incurred for the use of their personal cell phone and vehicle, on behalf of and in
17 furtherance of their employment with DEFENDANTS. Additionally, DEFENDANTS failed to
18 provide and/or make available to PLAINTIFF their personnel records, payroll records, time
19 records, employment contracts, and entire employment file within (30) days of all their request on
20 January 22, 2025. To date, DEFENDANTS have not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum,
21 overtime and double time compensation still owed to PLAINTIFF, or any penalty wages owed to
22 PLAINTIFF under California Labor Code Section 203. The amount in controversy for
23 PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

24 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

25 64. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF, and a California
26 class defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Hyatt Corporation
27 and/or Defendant Oceanside Beach Resort Owner and/or Defendant S.D. Malkin Properties and/or
28 Defendant S.D. Malkin Oceanside and/or Defendant DH2 Holding in California and classified as

1 non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period beginning four
2 (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court
3 (the “CLASS PERIOD”).

4 65. PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members have uniformly been
5 deprived of wages and penalties from unpaid wages earned and due, including but not limited to
6 unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, unpaid meal and rest period premiums,
7 illegal meal and rest period policies, failure to reimburse for business expenses, failure to
8 compensate for off-the-clock work, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, failure to
9 maintain required records, and interest, statutory and civil penalties, attorney’s fees, costs, and
10 expenses.

11 66. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
12 impractical.

13 67. Common questions of law and fact regarding DEFENDANTS’ conduct, including
14 but not limited to, off-the-clock work, unpaid meal and rest period premiums, failure to accurately
15 calculate the regular rate of pay for overtime compensation, failure to accurately calculate the
16 regular rate of compensation for missed meal and rest period premiums, failure to provide legally
17 compliant meal and rest periods, failure to reimburse for business expenses, failure to provide
18 accurate itemized wage statements, and failure to ensure they are paid at least minimum wage and
19 overtime, exist as to all members of the class and predominate over any questions affecting solely
20 any individual members of the class. Among the questions of law and fact common to the class are:

- 21 a. Whether DEFENDANTS maintained legally compliant meal period policies and
22 practices;
- 23 b. Whether DEFENDANTS maintained legally compliant rest period policies and
24 practices;
- 25 c. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
26 members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
- 27 d. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
28 members accurate overtime wages;

- 1 e. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
2 members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
- 3 f. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS members for required business expenses;
- 5 g. Whether DEFENDANTS issued legally compliant wage statements;
- 6 h. Whether DEFENDANTS committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
7 failing to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
8 CLASS for all time worked;
- 9 i. Whether DEFENDANTS committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
10 failing to record all meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and other
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS members, even though DEFENDANTS enjoyed the benefit
12 of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to
13 permit this work;
- 14 j. Whether DEFENDANTS committed an act of unfair competition in violation of
15 California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”), by
16 failing to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
17 CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

18 68. PLAINTIFF is a member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as a
19 result of DEFENDANTS’ conduct and actions alleged herein.

20 69. PLAINTIFFS’ claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and
21 PLAINTIFF has the same interests as the other members of the class.

22 70. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

24 71. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action
25 litigation.

26 72. Further, PLAINTIFF’S interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the
27 interest of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

28 ///

1 73. There is a strong community of interest among PLAINTIFF and the members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS to, inter alia, ensure that the combined assets of DEFENDANTS are
3 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries
4 sustained.

5 74. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS members
6 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, including legal and factual
7 issues relating to liability and damages.

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

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

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

22 76. Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring an
23 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims arising out of the
24 conduct of DEFENDANTS.

25
26
27
28 ///

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Unlawful Business Practices**

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

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

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

8 78. DEFENDANTS are each a “person” as that term is defined under California
9 Business and Professions Code Section 17021.

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

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

21 80. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS have engaged and continues to
22 engage in business practices which violate California law, including but not limited to, the
23 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
24 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and
25 2802, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to California
26 Business and Professions Code Section 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the
27 conduct held to constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

28 81. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS’ practices were unlawful and unfair
in that these practices violated public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressively unscrupulous
or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or utility for which this

1 Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section 17203 of the California
2 Business and Professions Code, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

3 82. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were deceptive and
4 fraudulent in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice failed to provide the legally
5 mandated meal and rest periods and the required amount of compensation for missed meal and rest
6 periods, failed to pay minimum and overtime wages owed, and failed to reimburse all necessary
7 business expenses incurred, due to a systematic business practice that cannot be justified, pursuant
8 to the applicable California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in
9 violation of California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this
10 Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to California Business and Professions
11 Code Section 17203, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

16 84. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were also unfair and
17 deceptive in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
18 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members as
19 required by California Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512.

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

25 86. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of PLAINTIFF and on behalf of each
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which a rest period was
27 not timely provided as required by law.
28

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

7 88. All the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the Industrial
8 Welfare Commission Wage Orders, the California Code of Regulations, and the California Labor
9 Code, were unlawful and in violation of public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive, and
10 unscrupulous, were deceptive, and thereby constitute unlawful, unfair, and deceptive business
11 practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*

12 89. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are entitled to,
13 and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to restore to them the money and property which
14 DEFENDANTS have acquired, or of which PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been deprived, by means of the above described unlawful and unfair
16 business practices, including earned but unpaid wages for all time worked.

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

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

28 ///

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

2

3

4

5
6
7

8
9
10
11

12
1314
15
1617
18
19

20
21
22
23
24

25
26
27
28

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

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

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

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

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

25 103. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor
26 laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked
27 and provide them with the requisite compensation, DEFENDANTS acted and continues to act
28 intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS with a conscious and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the
2 consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal
3 rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of
4 these employees.

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

16 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

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

20 105. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS reallege and
21 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this
22 Complaint.

23 106. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
24 DEFENDANTS' willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
25 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANTS' failure to pay these employees for all
26 overtime worked including work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve
27 (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

28 ///

1 107. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 204, other applicable laws and
2 regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.

3 108. California Labor Code Section 510 provides that employees in California shall not
4 be employed more than eight (8) hours per workday and/or more than forty (40) hours per
5 workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts
6 specified by law.

7 109. California Labor Code Section 1194 establishes an employee's right to recover
8 unpaid wages, including minimum and overtime compensation and interest thereon, together with
9 the costs of suit. California Labor Code Section 1198 further states that the employment of an
10 employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

11 110. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members
12 were required by DEFENDANTS to work for DEFENDANTS and were not paid for all the time
13 they worked, including overtime work.

14 111. DEFENDANTS' uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
15 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of implementing
16 a uniform policy and practice that failed to accurately record overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and
17 other CALIFORNIA CLASS members and denied accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF and the
18 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked, including, the overtime work
19 performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or
20 forty (40) hours in any workweek.

21 112. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANTS
22 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
23 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members. DEFENDANTS acted in an illegal
24 attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California
25 Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and
26 regulations.

27
28 ///

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

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

12 115. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for overtime worked than they were entitled to, constituting
14 a failure to pay all earned wages.

15 116. DEFENDANTS failed to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which was in excess of the
17 maximum hours permissible by law as required by California Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, and
18 1198, even though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were
19 regularly required to work, and did in fact work overtime, and did in fact work overtime as to which
20 DEFENDANTS failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business
21 records and witnessed by employees.

22 117. 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 amount of overtime they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
25 CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are presently
26 unknown to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

27 118. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
28 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were undercompensated for their time worked.

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

6 119. 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 of 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.

14 120. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS request
15 recovery of overtime 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 overtime compensation is determined to be
18 owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS members who have terminated their employment,
19 DEFENDANTS' conduct also violates California Labor Code Sections 201 and/or 202, and
20 therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under California Labor
21 Code 203, which penalties are sought herein. DEFENDANTS' conduct as alleged herein was
22 willful, intentional, and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
23 members are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

24
25
26
27
28 ///

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

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

3

4

5
6
7

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22
23
24
25
26

28

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

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods

(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)

(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS)

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

126. From time to time, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were also not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were periodically denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers. In addition, DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members for their rest periods as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. As a result, DEFENDANTS' failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members with all the legally required paid rest periods is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

127. DEFENDANTS further violated California Labor Code Sections 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, one

1 additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that rest
2 period was not provided.

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

6 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

8 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

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

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

13 130. California Labor Code Section 226 provides that an employer must furnish
14 employees with an "accurate itemized" statement in writing showing:

- 15 a. Gross wages earned,
16 b. total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation
17 is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under
18 subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare
19 Commission,
20 c. the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
21 is paid on a piece-rate basis,
22 d. all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee
23 may be aggregated and shown as one item,
24 e. net wages earned,
25 f. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
26 g. the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by
27 January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number of an
28

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.

131. 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.

132. 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).

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

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

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

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

8 135. California Labor Code Section 200 provides that:

9 As used in this article:

10 (d) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of every
11 description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time,
task, piece, commission basis, or other method of calculation.

12 (e) "Labor" includes labor, work, or service whether rendered or performed under
13 contract, subcontract, partnership, station plan, or other agreement if the labor to
be paid for is performed personally by the person demanding payment.

14 136. California Labor Code Section 201 provides, in relevant part, that "If an employer
15 discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable
16 immediately."

17 137. California Labor Code Section 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

18 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
19 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
20 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
21 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
22 of the notice of quitting.

23 138. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF'S or any CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 members' employment contract.

25 139. California Labor Code Section 203 provides:

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

140. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA CLASS members terminated, and DEFENDANTS have not tendered payment of wages to these employees who missed meal and rest breaks, as required by law.

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

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses

(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)

(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS)

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

143. California Labor Code Section 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

144. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANTS' benefit. DEFENDANTS failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, the use of their personal cell phones and vehicles, all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANTS. Specifically, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members to use their personal cell phones and vehicles, to execute their essential job duties on behalf of

1 DEFENDANTS. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy, practice and procedure was to not reimburse
2 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for expenses resulting from the use of their
3 personal cell phones and vehicles, within the course and scope of their employment for
4 DEFENDANTS. These expenses were necessary to complete their principal job duties.
5 DEFENDANTS are estopped by DEFENDANTS' conduct to assert any waiver of this expectation.
6 Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA
7 CLASS members, DEFENDANTS failed to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the
8 CALIFORNIA CLASS members for these expenses as an employer is required to do under the
9 laws and regulations of California.

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

14 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **Failure To Permit Inspection of Employee Records**

16 **(Cal. Lab. §§ 226, 432, 1198.5 and Applicable IWC Wage Orders)**

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

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

21 147. Labor Code Section 226(b) requires employers to make payroll records available to
22 employees upon reasonable request. Labor Code Section 226(c) further requires that the employer
23 comply with the request for records as soon as practicable, but no later than twenty-one (21)
24 calendar days from the date of request.

25 148. Labor Code Section 432 also entitles an employee to receive copies of any signed
26 documents related to the obtaining or holding of employment.

27 149. Labor Code § 1198.5 states that employees (and former employees) have the right
28 to inspect personnel records maintained by the employer "related to the employee's performance

1 or to any grievance concerning the employee.” Employers must allow inspection or copying
2 within thirty (30) days of the request.

3 150. The applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders require employers to
4 maintain accurate records for employees, including time records, and such records must be made
5 readily available for inspection by the employee upon a reasonable request.

6 151. On January 22, 2025, PLAINTIFF caused a written request via certified mail to be
7 delivered to DEFENDANTS for PLAINTIFF’S personnel and employment records, including but
8 not limited to: (1) payroll records; (2) employment contracts; (3) itemized pay stubs; (4) time
9 records; and (5) PLAINTIFF’S complete employment file.

10 152. DEFENDANTS failed to provide and/or make available to PLAINTIFF their
11 personnel records, payroll records, employment contract, and entire employment file within thirty
12 (30) days of their request stated above. In fact, as of the date of filing of this complaint,
13 DEFENDANT has still failed to pay PLAINTIFF the statutory penalty in the amount of \$750.

14 153. PLAINTIFF is now entitled to and requests injunctive relief to obtain compliance
15 with California Labor Code Sections 226, 432, 1198.5 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and
16 applicable statutory penalties and an award of attorneys’ fees and costs for bringing this action.

17 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **FAILURE TO PAY STATUTORY GRATUITIES**

19 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 351 et seq.)**

20 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS and against all**

21 **Defendants)**

22 154. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and
23 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this
24 Complaint.

25 155. DEFENDANT’S conduct, as set forth above, in failing to remit to non-managerial
26 employees the total proceeds of gratuities added to customers’ bills constitutes a violation of
27 California Labor Code Section 351. This violation is enforceable pursuant to the California Unfair
28 Competition Law, Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code 17200 et seq. DEFENDANT’S conduct constitutes

1 unlawful, unfair, and/or fraudulent business acts or practices, in that DEFENDANT has violated
2 California Labor Code Section 351 in not remitting to the non-managerial service employees the
3 total gratuities that were charged to customers.

4 156. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according to proof at trial,
6 including the loss of gratuities to which they were entitled. and seek all wages earned and due,
7 interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.

8 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

11 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 12 a. That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA
13 CLASS as a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382;
14 b. An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining
15 DEFENDANTS from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;
16 c. An order requiring DEFENDANTS to pay all overtime wages and all sums
17 unlawfully withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members
18 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and
19 d. Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANTS' ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund
20 for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANTS' violations due to
21 PLAINTIFF and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

22 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 23 a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth,
24 Ninth, and Tenth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class
25 action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382;
26 b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory
27 damages for overtime compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of
28 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest

thereon at the statutory rate;

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

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

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

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

3. On the Ninth Cause of Action

a. For an award of statutory damages as plead pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5.

b. For an injunction compelling production of Plaintiff's employment records pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226, 432 and 1198.5 and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

///

1 4. On all claims:

- 2 a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
- 3 b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and
- 4 c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law,
- 5 including and pursuant to, but not limited to, California Labor Code Sections 218.5,
- 6 226, 246 and/or 1194.

7 DATED: December 5, 2025

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

8 By: 
9 Shani Zakay, Esq.
10 Attorney for PLAINTIFF

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 ///

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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: December 5, 2025

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: 
Shani Zakay, Esq.
Attorney for PLAINTIFF