

SUMMONS

(CITACION JUDICIAL)

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

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

ISLAND SNACKS, INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

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

HORACIO OLGUIN, an individual, on behalf of Plaintiff, and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
7/24/2025 1:25 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By J. Nunez, Deputy Clerk

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): Los Angeles Superior Court

Stanley Mosk Courthouse - 111 North Hill Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

CASE NUMBER:
(Número del Caso):

258TCV21963

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. T: (619)599-8292 JCL Law Firm, APC - 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600, San Diego, CA 92121

DATE:

(Fecha) 07/24/2025

Clerk, by

(Secretario)

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court

J. Nunez

, Deputy

(Adjunto)

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)

(Para prueba de entrega de esta citación use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)).

[SEAL]



NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

- ☐ 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):

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

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

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
7/24/2025 1:25 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By J. Nunez, Deputy Clerk

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
shani@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 LOS ANGELES

HORACIO OLGUIN, an individual, on behalf
of Plaintiff, and on behalf of all persons
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

ISLAND SNACKS, INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No: **25STCV21963**

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;

- 1 6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE
2 ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN
3 VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
4 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN
5 DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB.
6 CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
7 8) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES
8 FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN
9 VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
10 9) FAILURE TO PERMIT INSPECTION OF
11 EMPLOYEE RECORDS IN VIOLATION
12 OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 1198.5.

13 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

14 PLAINTIFF HORACIO OLGUIN (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of
15 PLAINTIFF and all other similarly situated current and former employees, alleges on information
16 and belief, except for PLAINTIFF’S own acts and knowledge which are based on personal
17 knowledge, the following:

18 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

19 1. Defendant ISLAND SNACKS, INC. (“DEFENDANT” and/or “DEFENDANTS”)
20 is a California corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to
21 conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

22 2. DEFENDANT owns and operates a snack production company in California,
23 including in the County of Los Angeles, where PLAINTIFF worked.

24 3. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from March 2018
25 through September 2024, as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the
26 legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all
27 time worked.

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

5. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and a California
class, defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California

1 and classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the
2 period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as
3 determined by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate
4 claim of the CALIFORNIA CLASS members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

5 6. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and a
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses
7 incurred during the CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANT'S uniform policy and practice
8 which failed to lawfully compensate these employees. DEFENDANT'S uniform policy and
9 practice alleged herein was an unlawful, unfair, and deceptive business practice whereby
10 DEFENDANT retained and continue to retain wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of
11 the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek
12 an injunction enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named
13 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically
14 injured by DEFENDANT'S past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and
15 equitable relief.

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

25 8. The agents, servants and/or employees of DEFENDANT and each of them acting
26 on behalf of DEFENDANT acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as the
27 agent, servant and/or employee of DEFENDANT, and personally participated in the conduct
28 alleged herein on behalf of the DEFENDANT with respect to the conduct alleged herein.

1 Consequently, the acts of each DEFENDANT are legally attributable to the other DEFENDANT
2 and all DEFENDANTS are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF and the other members of
3 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the
4 DEFENDANTS' agents, servants and/or employees.

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

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

16 11. DEFENDANT'S uniform policies and practices alleged herein were unlawful,
17 unfair, and deceptive business practices whereby DEFENDANT retained and continues to retain
18 wages due to PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

19 12. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction
20 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and other
21 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically injured by DEFENDANT'S
22 past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable relief.

23 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

24 13. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil
25 Procedure Section 410.10 and California Business and Professions Code Section 17203. This action
26 is brought as a Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and similarly situated employees of
27 DEFENDANT pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382.

28 ///

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

THE CONDUCT

15. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for missed meal and rest periods, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for off-the-clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS meal and rest premiums at the regular rate of pay, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS redeemed sick pay at the regular rate of pay, failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for business expenses, and failed to issue to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with accurate itemized wage statements showing, among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay periods and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANT’S uniform policies and practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment for all time worked as required by California law which allows DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who comply with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

A. Meal Period Violations

16. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members for all their time worked,

1 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all
2 the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the CLASS
3 PERIOD, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members to work
4 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT’S control. Specifically,
5 DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be
6 PLAINTIFFS’ off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not even
7 receive a partial lunch. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members
8 forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their time being
9 accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates.
10 DEFENDANT’S uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
11 CLASS members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANT’S business records.

12 17. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work
13 schedules and DEFENDANT’S inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS members are from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off-duty
15 meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS members are required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for
17 more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further, DEFENDANT
18 failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members with a second off-duty meal
19 period for some workdays in which these employees are required by DEFENDANT to work ten
20 (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
21 CLASS members does not qualify for the limited and narrowly construed “on-duty” meal period
22 exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call. DEFENDANT’S
24 failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members with legally required meal
25 breaks is evidenced by DEFENDANT’S business records. As a result of their rigorous work
26 schedules and DEFENDANT’S inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF and other members of the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in
28 accordance with DEFENDANT’S strict corporate policy and practice.

1 **B. Rest Period Violations**

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

16 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

28 ///

1 20. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS members to incur personal expenses as a result of and in furtherance of
3 their job duties. However, DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS members for the use of their personal expenses. As a result, in the course
5 of their employment with DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
6 members incurred unreimbursed business expenses, all on behalf of and for the benefit of
7 DEFENDANT.

8 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

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

24 23. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide
25 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with
26 California Labor Code Section 226.

27 24. As a result, DEFENDANT issued PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
28 members with wage statements that violate California Lab. Code § 226(a)(1)-(9). Further,

1 DEFENDANT'S violations are knowing and intentional, and were not isolated due to an
2 unintentional payroll error due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

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

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

7 26. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
8 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
9 work. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members having to work
10 while off-the-clock.

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

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

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

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

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

27 32. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFFS' and the other
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS members' off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

1 33. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
2 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT’S direction, control, and benefit
3 for the time spent working while off-the-clock. DEFENDANT’S uniform policy and practice to not
4 pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all hours worked in
5 accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT’S business records.

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

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

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

21 36. The second component of PLAINTIFF’S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
22 members’ compensation was DEFENDANT’S non-discretionary incentive program that paid
23 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members incentive wages based on their
24 performance for DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees
25 paid on an hourly basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance
26 goals set by DEFENDANT.

27 37. However, from time to time, when calculating the regular rate of pay in those pay
28 periods where PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members worked overtime, double

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

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

27
28 ///

1 **G. Unlawful Deductions**

2 39. DEFENDANT, from time-to-time, unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF'S
3 and CALIFORNIA CLASS members' pay without explanations and without authorization to do
4 so or notice to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members. As a result, DEFENDANT
5 violated Labor Code Section 221.

6 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

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

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

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

27 43. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
28 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT'S direction, control and benefit

1 for the time that the timekeeping system was inoperable. DEFENDANT’S uniform policy and
2 practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all hours
3 worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT’S business records.

4 **I. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

5 44. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT did not have in place
6 an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS members for the actual time these employees worked each day, including
8 overtime hours. Specifically, DEFENDANT had in place an unlawful rounding policy and practice
9 that resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members being undercompensated for all
10 their time worked. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact unlawfully and
11 unilaterally round the time recorded in DEFENDANT’S timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and
12 the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees for all their
13 time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for overtime worked. As a result,
14 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time, forfeited
15 compensation for their time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and
16 without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

17 45. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANT’S timekeeping system and unlawful
18 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members’ time
19 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANT’S unlawful rounding
20 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members to perform work as
21 ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty
22 meal break.

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

24 46. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 204, PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA
25 CLASS members were entitled to timely payment of wages during their employment. PLAINTIFF
26 and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time, did not receive payment of all wages,
27 including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period premium wages, and
28 rest period premium wages within the permissible time period.

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

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

13 **K. Sick Pay Violations**

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

22 50. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its employees
23 with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available. From time to
24 time, DEFENDANT violated California Labor Code Section 246 by failing to furnish PLAINTIFF
25 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements setting forth the amount of
26 paid sick leave available.

27
28 ///

1 **L. Failure to Provide Personnel Files**

2 51. On February 20, 2025, and April 15, 2025 PLAINTIFF caused written requests
3 via certified mail to be delivered to DEFENDANT for PLAINTIFF’S personnel and employment
4 records, including but not limited to: (1) payroll records; (2) employment contracts; (3) itemized
5 pay stubs; and (4) PLAINTIFF’S complete employment file.

6 52. DEFENDANT failed to provide and/or make available to PLAINTIFF their
7 personnel records, payroll records, employment contract, and entire employment file within thirty
8 (30) days of their requests stated above. In fact, as of the date of filing of this complaint,
9 DEFENDANT have still failed to pay PLAINTIFF the statutory penalty in the amount of \$750.
10 DEFENDANT violated California Labor Code Section 1198.5 by failing to respond and provide
11 PLAINTIFF with their employment file. Section 1198.5 states that employees (and former
12 employees) have the right to inspect personnel records maintained by the employer “related to
13 the employee’s performance or to any grievance concerning the employee.” Employers must
14 allow inspection or copying within thirty (30) days of the request. PLAINTIFF is now entitled to
15 and requests injunctive relief to obtain compliance with California Labor Code Section 1198.5, a
statutory penalty, and an award of attorneys’ fees and costs for bringing this action.

16 53. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
17 off-duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for their rest and meal periods.
18 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5)
19 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to
20 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which they were required
21 by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANT provided PLAINTIFF
22 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on-duty and on-call for the rest break.
23 DEFENDANT’S policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during what was
24 supposed to be their off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks
25 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT’S strict corporate policy
26 and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANT also provided PLAINTIFF with paystubs that failed to
27 comply with California Labor Code Section 226. Further, DEFENDANT also failed to reimburse
28 PLAINTIFF for required business expenses related to the personal expenses incurred on behalf of

1 and in furtherance of their employment with DEFENDANT. Additionally, DEFENDANT failed
2 to provide and/or make available to PLAINTIFF their personnel records, payroll records,
3 employment contracts, and entire employment file within (30) days of all their requests on
4 February 20, 2025, and April 15, 2025. To date, DEFENDANT have not fully paid PLAINTIFF
5 the minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed to them, or any penalty wages
6 owed to them under California Labor Code Section 203. The amount in controversy for
7 PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

8 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

9 54. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF, and a California
10 class defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California
11 and classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the
12 period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as
13 determined by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”).

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

21 56. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
22 impractical.

23 57. Common questions of law and fact regarding DEFENDANT’S conduct, including
24 but not limited to, off-the-clock work, unpaid meal and rest period premiums, failure to accurately
25 calculate the regular rate of pay for overtime compensation, failure to accurately calculate the
26 regular rate of compensation for missed meal and rest period premiums, failure to provide legally
27 compliant meal and rest periods, failure to reimburse for business expenses, failure to provide
28 accurate itemized wage statements, and failure to ensure they are paid at least minimum wage and

overtime, exist as to all members of the class and predominate over any questions affecting solely any individual members of the class. Among the questions of law and fact common to the class are:

- a. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant meal period policies and practices;
- b. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant rest period policies and practices;
- c. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
- d. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members accurate overtime wages;
- e. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
- f. Whether DEFENDANT failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for required business expenses;
- g. Whether DEFENDANT issued legally compliant wage statements;
- h. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically failing to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked;
- i. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically failing to record all meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to permit this work;
- j. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition in violation of California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”), by failing to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

///

1 58. PLAINTIFF is a member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as a
2 result of DEFENDANT' conduct and actions alleged herein.

3 59. PLAINTIFFS' claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and
4 PLAINTIFF has the same interests as the other members of the class.

5 60. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

7 61. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action
8 litigation.

9 62. Further, PLAINTIFF'S interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the
10 interest of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

11 63. There is a strong community of interest among PLAINTIFF and the members of the
12 CALIFORNIA CLASS to, inter alia, ensure that the combined assets of DEFENDANT are
13 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries
14 sustained.

15 64. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS members
16 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, including legal and factual
17 issues relating to liability and damages.

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

- 25 a. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish incompatible standards of conduct
27 for the parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and/or,
28

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

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

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Unlawful Business Practices

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

(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANT)

67. 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.

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

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

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

70. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT have engaged and continues to engage in business practices which violate California law, including but not limited to, the applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802, for which this Court

1 should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to California Business and Professions
2 Code Section 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to constitute
3 unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

4 71. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’S practices were unlawful and unfair
5 in that these practices violated public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressively unscrupulous
6 or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or utility for which this
7 Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section 17203 of the California
8 Business and Professions Code, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

18 73. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’S practices were also unlawful,
19 unfair, and deceptive in that DEFENDANT’S employment practices caused PLAINTIFF and the
20 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with
21 DEFENDANTS.

22 74. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’S practices were also unfair and
23 deceptive in that DEFENDANT’S uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
24 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members as
25 required by California Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512.

26 75. Therefore, PLAINTIFF demands on behalf of PLAINTIFF and on behalf of each
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty meal
28 period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of pay for each

workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for each ten (10) hours of work.

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

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

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

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

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

PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no plain, speedy and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business practices of DEFENDANT. Further, the practices herein alleged presently continue to occur unabated. As a

1 result of the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein, PLAINTIFF and the other
2 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable legal
3 and economic harm unless DEFENDANTS are restrained from continuing to engage in these
4 unlawful and unfair business practices.

5 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

8 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANT)**

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

12 82. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
13 DEFENDANT'S willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
14 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT'S failure to accurately calculate and pay
15 minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

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

18 84. California Labor Code Section 1197 provides the minimum wage for employees
19 fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less
20 wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

21 85. California Labor Code Section 1194 establishes an employee's right to recover
22 unpaid wages, including minimum wage compensation and interest thereon, together with the costs
23 of suit.

24 86. DEFENDANT maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the
25 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time they
26 work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT'S uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and
27 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

1 87. DEFENDANT’S uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
2 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of implementing
3 a uniform policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other
4 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in regard to minimum wage pay.

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

11 89. As a direct result of DEFENDANT’S unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
12 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive the correct
13 minimum wage compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANT.

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

17 91. By virtue of DEFENDANT’S unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
18 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the true
19 time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered
20 and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are presently unknown to them,
21 and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

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

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

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

20 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

23 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANT)**

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

27 96. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
28 DEFENDANT'S willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial

1 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT’S failure to pay these employees for all
2 overtime worked including work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve
3 (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

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

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

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

14 100. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members
15 were required by DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time they
16 worked, including overtime work.

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

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

1 103. As a direct result of DEFENDANT’S 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 DEFENDANT.

4 104. 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 DEFENDANT’S violations of non-negotiable, non-waivable rights provided by the State of
11 California.

12 105. 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.

15 106. DEFENDANT 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 DEFENDANT failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANT’S business
21 records and witnessed by employees.

22 107. By virtue of DEFENDANT’S 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.

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

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

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

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

23
24
25
26
27
28 ///

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

5 111. 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.

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

22 113. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code Section 226.7 and the
23 applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 members who were not provided a meal 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 a
26 meal period was not provided.

27
28 ///

114. 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 DEFENDANT)

115. 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.

116. 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 DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT'S managers. In addition, DEFENDANT 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, DEFENDANT'S failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members with all the legally required paid rest periods is evidenced by DEFENDANT'S business records.

117. DEFENDANT 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.

3 118. 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 DEFENDANT)**

10 119. 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.

13 120. 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.

121. When DEFENDANT 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, DEFENDANT violated California Labor Code Section 226 in that DEFENDANT 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.

122. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT 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).

123. DEFENDANT 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 DEFENDANT)**

5 124. 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.

8 125. 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.

14 126. 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."

17 127. 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.

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

25 129. 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.

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

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

10 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

12 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

13 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANT)**

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

17 133. California Labor Code Section 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:
18 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or
19 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
20 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.

21 134. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT violated California
22 Labor Code Section 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties
24 for DEFENDANT'S benefit. DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS members for expenses incurred all on behalf of and for the benefit of
26 DEFENDANT. DEFENDANT'S uniform policy, practice and procedure was to not reimburse
27 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for expenses within the course and scope
28 of their employment for DEFENDANT. These expenses were necessary to complete their principal

1 job duties. DEFENDANTS are estopped by DEFENDANTS' conduct to assert any waiver of this
2 expectation. Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF and the
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS members, DEFENDANT failed to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF
4 and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for these expenses as an employer is required to do under
5 the laws and regulations of California.

6 135. PLAINTIFF therefore demands reimbursement for expenditures or losses incurred
7 by them and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members in the discharge of their job duties for
8 DEFENDANT, or their obedience to the directions of DEFENDANT, with interest at the statutory
9 rate and costs under California Labor Code Section 2802.

10 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

12 **(Cal. Lab. § 1198.5)**

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

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

17 137. Labor Code § 1198.5 states that employees (and former employees) have the right
18 to inspect personnel records maintained by the employer "related to the employee's performance
19 or to any grievance concerning the employee." Employers must allow inspection or copying
20 within thirty (30) days of the request.

21 138. On February 20, 2025, and April 15, 2025, PLAINTIFF caused written requests
22 via certified mail to be delivered to DEFENDANT for PLAINTIFF'S personnel and employment
23 records, including but not limited to: (1) payroll records; (2) employment contracts; (3) itemized
24 pay stubs; and (4) PLAINTIFF'S complete employment file.

25 139. DEFENDANT failed to provide and/or make available to PLAINTIFF their
26 personnel records, payroll records, employment contract, and entire employment file within thirty
27 (30) days of their requests stated above. In fact, as of the date of filing of this complaint,
28 DEFENDANT has still failed to pay PLAINTIFF the statutory penalty in the amount of \$750.

1 140. PLAINTIFF is now entitled to and requests injunctive relief to obtain compliance
2 with Cal. Lab. Code Section 1198.5, a statutory penalty, and an award of attorneys' fees and costs
3 for bringing this action.

4 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for a judgment against all DEFENDANT, jointly and
6 severally, as follows:

7 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

18 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

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

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

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

10 3. On the Ninth Cause of Action

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

12 b. For an injunction compelling production of Plaintiff's employment records
13 pursuant to Labor Code §1198.5.

14 4. On all claims:


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

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

17 c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law,
18 including and pursuant to, but not limited to, California Labor Code Sections 218.5,
19 226, 246 and/or 1194.

20
21 DATED: July 24, 2025

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

22 By: 
23 Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.
24 Attorney for PLAINTIFF
25
26
27
28

///

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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: July 24, 2025

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

By: 

Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.
Attorney for PLAINTIFF