

**SUMMONS
(CITACION JUDICIAL)**

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

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego
11/14/2022 at 08:00:00 AM
Clerk of the Superior Court
By Carla Brennan, Deputy Clerk

**NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:
(AVISO AL DEMANDADO):**

IMPERIAL PARKING (U.S.), LLC., a Delaware limited liability company; REEF TECHNOLOGY INC., a Delaware corporation; (See attached)

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

ANDREW CARO, an individual, on behalf of himself, 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): Hall of Justice
330 W Broadway, San Diego, CA 92101

CASE NUMBER:
(Número del Caso):
37-2022-00045548-CU-OE-CTL

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):
Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq. (SBN: 248676) 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600, San Diego, CA 92121, T: (619) 599-8292

DATE: 11/14/2022 Clerk, by C. Brennan, Deputy
(Fecha) (Secretario) _____ C. Brennan _____ (Adjunto)

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



NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

- as an individual defendant.
- as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
- 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):
- by personal delivery on (date):

SHORT TITLE: Caro v. Imperial Parking (U.S.), LLC., et al.	CASE NUMBER:
---	--------------

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

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

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

Plaintiff
 Defendant
 Cross-Complainant
 Cross-Defendant

AMERIPARK, LLC., a Georgia limited liability company; LANIER PARKING METER SERVICES, LLC, a Georgia limited liability company; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Page _____ of _____

Page 1 of 1

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
Sydney Castillo Johnson (State Bar #343881)
Monnett De La Torre (State Bar #272884)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292
Facsimile: (619) 599-8291
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
scastillo@jcl-lawfirm.com
mdelatorre@jcl-lawfirm.com

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
Julieann Alvarado (State Bar #334727)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 5400
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
shani@zakaylaw.com
jackland@zakaylaw.com
julieann@zakaylaw.com

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

ANDREW CARO, an individual, on behalf of himself, and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

IMPERIAL PARKING (U.S.), LLC., a Delaware limited liability company; REEF TECHNOLOGY INC., a Delaware corporation; AMERIPARK, LLC., a Georgia limited liability company; LANIER PARKING METER SERVICES, LLC, a Georgia limited liability company; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No: 37-2022-00045548-CU-0E-CTL

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

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

- LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
- 6) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
 - 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
 - 8) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF ANDREW CARO (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated current and former employees, allege on information and belief, except for his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS

1. Defendant IMPERIAL PARKING (U.S.), LLC (“Defendant Imperial Parking”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

2. Defendant REEF TECHNOLOGY INC. (“Defendant Reef Technology”) is a Delaware corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

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

4. Defendant LANIER PARKING METER SERVICES, LLC (“Defendant Lanier Parking”) is a Georgia limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

5. Defendant Imperial Parking, Defendant Reef Technology, Defendant AmeriPark and Defendant Lanier Parking were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the documents issued to PLAINTIFF and by the company PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively and are therefore jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein as

1 “DEFENDANTS” and/or “DEFENDANT.”

2 6. DEFENDANTS provide parking services the state of California, including in the
3 county of San Diego, where PLAINTIFF worked.

4 7. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from September of
5 2021 to November of 2021 as a non-exempt employee, paid an hourly basis, and entitled to the
6 legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all
7 time worked.

8 8. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class,
9 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Imperial Parking and/or
10 Defendant Reef Technology and/or Defendant AmeriPark and/or Defendant Lanier Parking in
11 California and classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time
12 during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the
13 date as determined by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”). The amount in controversy for the
14 aggregate claim of the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars
15 (\$5,000,000.00).

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

27 10. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
28 partnership, associate or otherwise of DEFENDANTS DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are

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

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

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

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

27 14. DEFENDANT'S uniform policies and practices alleged herein were unlawful,
28 unfair, and deceptive business practices whereby DEFENDANT retained and continue to retain

1 wages due to PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

2 15. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction
3 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and
4 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who has been economically injured by
5 DEFENDANT’s past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable
6 relief.

7 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

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

16 **THE CONDUCT**

17 18. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
18 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a
19 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically
20 failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate
21 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for missed meal and rest
22 periods, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all
23 time worked, failed compensate PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 for off-the-clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
25 CLASS overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other
26 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS meal rest premiums at the regular rate, failed to reimburse
27 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for business expenses, and failed to issue
28 to PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with accurate itemized wage

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

8 **A. Meal Period Violations**

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

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

1 DEFENDANT fails to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second
2 off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees are required by DEFENDANT
3 to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members does not qualify for the limited and narrowly construed “on-
5 duty” meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call.
7 DEFENDANT’s failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with
8 legally required meal breaks is evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business records. PLAINTIFF and
9 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional
10 compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT’s strict corporate policy and practice.

11 **B. Rest Period Violations**

12 21. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without
14 being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and
15 DEFENDANT’s inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons, these employees were denied
16 their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four
17 (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some
18 shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and
19 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from
20 time to time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
21 CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and/or on call. PLAINTIFF
22 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu*
23 thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANT’s inadequate staffing,
24 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time denied their
25 proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT’s managers.

26 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

27 22. DEFENDANT as a matter of corporate policy, practice, and procedure,
28 intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to reimburse and indemnify the PLAINTIFF

1 and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for required business expenses incurred by the
2 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members in direct consequence of discharging
3 their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers
4 are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their
5 employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her
6 employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence
7 of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer,
8 even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them
9 to be unlawful."

10 23. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell
12 phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to use their personal cell phones in order to
14 perform work related tasks. However, DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF
15 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the personal expenses incurred for the use of their
16 personal cell phones. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT,
17 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred unreimbursed business
18 expenses that included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cell
19 phones, all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

20 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

1 25. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for
3 missed meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT also
4 failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and
5 accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the total hours
6 worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, and the corresponding
7 amount of time worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed
8 meal and rest periods.

9 26. Further, from time to time, DEFENDANTS included “Holiday” and “CA Meal
10 Penalty” hours into the computation of total hours worked for purposes of Cal. Lab. Code
11 §226(a)(2), notwithstanding the fact that “Holiday” and “CA Meal Penalty” hours are not
12 considered hours worked. DEFENDANTS’ inclusion of “Holiday” and “CA Meal Penalty” hours
13 into the total hours worked in itemized wage statements issued to PLAINTIFFS and other
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members violates Cal. Lab. Code §226(a)(2).

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

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

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

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

26 30. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
27 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
28 working. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to have

1 to work while off-the-clock.

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

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

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

10 34. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
11 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to
12 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
13 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

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

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

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

24 38. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
25 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT's direction, control, and
26 benefit for the time spent working while off-the-clock. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and
27 practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all
28 hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business

1 records.

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

4 39. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and
5 continues to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS
6 Members for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and
7 redeemed sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
8 forfeited wages due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime
9 and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates.
10 DEFENDANT’s uniform policy and practice not to pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at
11 the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and
12 redeemed sick pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business
13 records.

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

18 41. The second component of PLAINTIFF’s and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
19 Members’ compensation was DEFENDANTS’ non-discretionary incentive program that paid
20 PLAINTIFF and other CLASS MEMBERS incentive wages based on their performance for
21 DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly
22 basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by
23 DEFENDANTS.

24 42. However, from-time-to-time, when calculating the regular rate of pay, in those pay
25 periods where PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members worked overtime, double
26 time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-
27 discretionary bonus, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus
28 compensation as part of the employees’ “regular rate of pay” and/or calculated all hours worked

1 rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the
2 incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
3 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS members must be included in the “regular rate of pay.” The failure to do so has resulted
5 in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period
6 premiums, and redeemed sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members by
7 DEFENDANTS. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid sick time
8 for non-employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the
9 workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee
10 actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANTS’ conduct, as articulated herein, by
11 failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the “regular rate of pay” for purposes of
12 sick pay compensation was in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the underpayment of which is
13 recoverable under Cal. Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203 and/or 204.

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

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

26 44. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, PLAINTIFF and the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were entitled to timely payment of wages during their
28 employment. PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time, did not

1 receive payment of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages,
2 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages within permissible time period.

3 **H. Unlawful Deductions**

4 45. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF
5 and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' pay without explanations and without authorization to do
6 so or notice to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. As a result,
7 DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code § 221.

8 **I. Timekeeping Manipulation**

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

18 47. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, from
19 time-to-time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and
20 without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

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

28 49. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS

1 during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the
2 date as determined by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”).

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

9 53. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
10 impractical.

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

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

28

- 1 e. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
- 2 Members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
- 3 f. Whether DEFENDANT failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA
- 4 CLASS Members for required business expenses;
- 5 g. Whether DEFENDANT issued legally compliant wage statements;
- 6 h. Whether DEFENDANT 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 DEFENDANT 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 DEFENDANT 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 DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition in violation of the
- 15 UCL, by failing to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
- 16 CALIFORNIA CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

17 55. PLAINTIFF are members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as
18 a result of DEFENDANT’s conduct and actions alleged herein.

19 56. PLAINTIFF’S claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and
20 PLAINTIFF have the same interests as the other members of the class.

21 57. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

23 58. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action
24 litigation.

25 59. Further, PLAINTIFF’S interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the
26 interest of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

27 60. There is a strong community of interest among PLAINTIFF and the members of
28 the CALIFORNIA CLASS to, inter alia, ensure that the combined assets of DEFENDANT are

1 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries
2 sustained.

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

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

- 14 a. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish incompatible standards of conduct
16 for the parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and/or,
- 17 b. Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
18 which would as a practical matter be dispositive of the interests of the other
19 members not party to the adjudication or substantially impair or impeded their
20 ability to protect their interests.

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

24
25
26
27
28 ///

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Unlawful Business Practices**

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

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

5 64. 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 65. DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. And Prof.
9 Code § 17021.

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

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

21 67. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to
22 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
23 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
24 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 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 Cal.
26 Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to
27 constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

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

3 69. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were deceptive and
4 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT's 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
6 rest periods, failed to pay minimum and overtime wages owed, and failed to reimburse all
7 necessary business expenses incurred, due to a systematic business practice that cannot be
8 justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission
9 requirements in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this Court should
10 issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including
11 restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

16 71. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unfair and
17 deceptive in that DEFENDANT's 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 Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

20 72. Therefore, PLAINTIFF demands on behalf of himself 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
23 each workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for each ten (10)
24 hours of work.

25 73. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of himself 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 74. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
2 DEFENDANT has 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
4 has deprived them of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and contract, all to the
5 detriment of these employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANT so as to allow DEFENDANT
6 to unfairly compete against competitors who comply with the law.

7 75. 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 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

12 76. 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 DEFENDANT has 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 77. 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,
19 and deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining DEFENDANT from
20 engaging in any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

21 78. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no plain,
22 speedy and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business practices of
23 DEFENDANT. 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 DEFENDANT is restrained from continuing to engage in these
27 unlawful and unfair business practices.

28 ///

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

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

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

13 89. By virtue of DEFENDANT's 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
16 suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are presently unknown
17 to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

18 90. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
19 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under-compensated for their time worked.
20 DEFENDANT 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 DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay
23 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct minimum wages
24 for their time worked.

25 91. 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, DEFENDANT 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 92. 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
7 assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the
8 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent minimum wage
9 compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have
10 terminated their employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or
11 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab.
12 Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA CLASS
13 Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good
14 faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are entitled to seek and
15 recover statutory 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 ALL Defendants)**

20 93. 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 94. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
24 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
25 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees for all
26 overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or
27 twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.
28

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

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

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

10 98. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
11 were required by DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time
12 they worked, including overtime work.

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

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

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

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

9 103. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for overtime worked that they were entitled to, constituting
11 a failure to pay all earned wages.

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

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

24 106. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
25 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were undercompensated for their time worked.
26 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
27 nonfeasance, to not pay them for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice and
28 procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF

1 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct overtime wages for their
2 overtime worked.

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

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

21 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

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

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

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

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

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

20 112. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according to proof at trial,
22 and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.
23
24
25
26

27 ///
28

1 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

5 113. 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.

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

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

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

4 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

6 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

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

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

11 118. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:
12 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or
13 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
14 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.

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

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

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

8 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

10 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

22 125. Further, from time to time, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately list the name and
23 address of the legal entity that is the employer for purposes of Cal. Lab. Code §226(a)(8).
24 DEFENDANTS failure to accurately list the name and address of the legal entity that is the
25 employer violates Cal. Lab. Code §226(a)(8).

26 126. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT failed to provide itemized wage
27 statements to PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that complied with the
28 requirements of California Labor Code Section 226.

1 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
2 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
3 thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention
4 to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.
5 Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a
6 72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and
7 designates a mailing address. The date of the mailing shall constitute the date of payment
8 for purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of
9 quitting.

10 132. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF'S or any CALIFORNIA CLASS
11 Members' employment contract.

12 133. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

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

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

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

26 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

27 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for a judgment against each Defendant, jointly and
28 severally, as follows:

1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

2. That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA
CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
3. An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining
DEFENDANT from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;
4. An order requiring DEFENDANT to pay all overtime wages and all sums

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

unlawfully withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and

d. Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANT’s ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANT’s violations due to PLAINTIFF and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;

b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory damages for overtime compensation and separately owed rest periods, due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;

c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 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 Cal. Lab. Code § 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 Cal. Lab. Code § 203.

///


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

3. On all claims:

- a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
- b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and
- c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as allowable under the law.

DATED: November 11, 2022

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

By: 

Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.


Attorney for PLAINTIFF

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: November 11, 2022

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

By: 

Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.

Attorney for PLAINTIFF