

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

1 Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
2 Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
3 Julieann Alvarado (State Bar #334727)
4 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
5 San Diego, CA 92121
6 Telephone: (619) 255-9047
7 Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
8 shani@zakaylaw.com
9 jackland@zakaylaw.com
10 julieann@zakaylaw.com

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

8 Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
9 Eduardo Garcia (State Bar #290572)
10 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
11 San Diego, CA 92121
12 Telephone: (619) 599-8292
13 Facsimile: (619) 599-8291
14 jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
15 egarcia@jcl-lawfirm.com

16 Attorneys for Plaintiff ALAN CARRILLO RODRIGUEZ

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN

17 ALAN CARRILLO RODRIGUEZ, an
18 individual, on behalf of himself and on behalf of
19 all persons similarly situated,

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 TITAN WORKFORCE, a California
23 Corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

24 Defendants.

Case No: STK-CV-UOE-2022- 3030

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

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

FILED
SUPERIOR COURT-STOCKTON
2022 APR 26 AM 10:49
BRANDON E. RILEY, CLERK
DANIELLE JEANDEBIEN
BY _____ DEPUTY

FILE BY FAX

DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203; and,
8) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE §2802;
9) VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT [LABOR CODE §§ 2698 ET SEQ.]

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

THE PARTIES

1. Defendant TITAN WORKFORCE (“DEFENDANT”) is a California corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business in the state of California, owns, operates, and/or manages construction services in the residential and commercial construction industry throughout the county of San Joaquin.

2. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary, partnership, associate or otherwise of DEFENDANT DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these DEFENDANT by such fictitious names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that the DEFENDANT named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, (hereinafter collectively “DEFENDANTS” and/or “DEFENDANT”) are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

3. The agents, servants, and/or employees of the DEFENDANT and each of them acting on behalf of the DEFENDANT acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as the agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendant, and personally participated in the conduct

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

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

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

17 6. PLAINTIFF has been employed by DEFENDANT in California from August of
18 2021 to November of 2021 and at all times has been classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt
19 employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and
20 payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

21 7. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class,
22 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and
23 classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period
24 beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined
25 by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of the
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

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

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

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

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

18 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

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

28 ///

THE CONDUCT

13. 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 compensate PLAINTIFF 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 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS meal rest premiums at the regular rate, failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for business expenses, and failed to issue to PLAINTIFF and the 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

14. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. Specifically, as a result of PLAINTIFF's demanding work requirements and DEFENDANT'S understaffing,

1 DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF to work during what was supposed to be PLAINTIFF's off-
2 duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not even receive a partial
3 lunch. As a result, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited
4 minimum wage and overtime wages by regularly working without their time being accurately
5 recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates.
6 DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
7 CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

8 15. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work
9 requirements and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off-
11 duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and
12 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required from time to time to perform work as
13 ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a
14 meal break. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which
16 these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work from time to
17 time. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
18 Members does not qualify for limited and narrowly construed "on-duty" meal period exception.
19 When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
20 Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call. PLAINTIFF and other
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional
22 compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

23 **B. Rest Period Violations**

24 16. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were also required from time to time to work in excess of four
26 (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work
27 requirements and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons these
28 employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked

1 of at least two (2) to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten
2 (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and
3 a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10)
4 hours or more from time to time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and
5 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and/or
6 on call. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one-
7 hour wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANT's
8 inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to
9 time denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

10 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

22 18. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to use their personal cell phones, personal vehicles, and
24 personal expenses for the purchase of tools as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as
25 employees for DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were
26 often required to use their personal vehicles to drive between different job sites and were required
27 to use their personal cell phones to communicate with project managers. Additionally,
28 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to incur personal expenses

1 as a result of purchasing tools in order to perform work-related tasks for DEFENDANT. But for
2 the use of their own personal cell phones, personal vehicles, and personal expenses for the
3 purchase of tools, PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members could not complete their
4 essential job duties. Additionally, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members often
5 incurred personal expenses in the line of business that were required to complete their essential
6 job duties. However, DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for their use of their personal cell phones, personal vehicles,
8 and personal expenses for the purchase of tools. As a result, in the course of their employment
9 with DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred
10 unreimbursed business expenses, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal
11 cellular phones, personal vehicles, and personal expenses for the purchase of tools, all on behalf
12 of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

13 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

22 20. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurate missed
24 meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT also failed
25 to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and accurate
26 wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the total hours worked and all
27 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time
28

1 worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest
2 periods.

3 21. DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226.
5 Specifically, DEFENDANT failed to include the correct total number of hours worked on the
6 wage statements.

7 22. As a result, DEFENDANT issued PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
8 CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements that violate Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further,
9 DEFENDANT's violations are knowing and intentional, were not isolated or due to an
10 unintentional payroll error due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

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

12 23. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT failed and
13 continue to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
14 CLASS for all hours worked.

15 24. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
16 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform post-shift work,
17 including but not limited to, cleaning up the job sites after shifts, and spending time under
18 DEFENDANT's control for which he was not compensated. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and
19 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to have to work while off-the-clock.

20 25. DEFENDANT directed benefited from the uncompensated off-the-clock work
21 performed by PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

22 26. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, protocols, applications,
23 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

25 27. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
26 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to
27 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
28 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed, including cleaning up after shifts.

1 28. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were non-
2 exempt employees, subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.

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

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

10 31. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
11 forfeited wages due them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT's direction, control and benefit
12 for the time spent working while off-the-clock. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice to
13 not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all hours worked
14 in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

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

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

26 33. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times
27 their "regular rate of pay."
28

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

12 **G. Unlawful Rounding Violations**

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

25 36. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system and unlawful
26 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' time
27 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANTS' unlawful rounding
28 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work

1 as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an
2 off-duty meal break. Additionally, DEFENDANTS' unlawful rounding policy and practice
3 caused PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work as ordered by
4 DEFENDANTS for more than ten (10) hours during a shift without receiving a second off-duty
5 meal break.

6 37. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
7 off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for his rest and meal periods.
8 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5)
9 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to
10 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which he was required
11 by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANTS provided PLAINTIFF
12 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on-duty and on-call, for the rest break.
13 DEFENDANTS' policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during what was
14 supposed to be his off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks
15 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS' strict corporate policy
16 and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANTS also provided PLAINTIFF with a paystub that failed to
17 comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF for
18 the use of his personal cell phone, personal vehicle, and personal expenses for the purchase of
19 tools as a result of and in furtherance of his job duties for DEFENDANTS. To date,
20 DEFENDANTS have not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and double time
21 compensation still owed to him or any penalty wages owed to him under Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
22 The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of
23 \$75,000.

24 **H. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

25 38. PLAINTIFF brings the First through Eighth Causes of Action as a class action
26 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 on behalf of all of DEFENDANT's current
27 and former non-exempt California employees ("CALIFORNIA CLASS") during the period
28

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

3 39. 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 40. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
10 impractical.

11 41. Common questions of law and fact regarding DEFENDANT’s conduct, including
12 but not limited to, the off-the-clock work, unpaid meal and rest period premiums, failure to
13 accurately calculate the regular rate of pay for overtime compensation, failure to accurately
14 calculate the regular rate of compensation for missed meal and rest period premiums, failing to
15 provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to reimburse for business expenses, failure
16 to provide accurate itemized wage statements accurate, and failure to ensure they are paid at least
17 minimum wage and overtime, exist as to all members of the class and predominate over any
18 questions affecting solely any individual members of the class. Among the questions of law and
19 fact 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 42. PLAINTIFF is a member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as
18 a result of DEFENDANT’s conduct and actions alleged herein.

19 43. PLAINTIFF’s claims are typical of the claims of the class, and PLAINTIFF has
20 the same interests as the other members of the class.

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

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

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

27 47. 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 48. 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 49. 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 50. 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 51. 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 52. DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. And Prof.
9 Code § 17021.

10 53. 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
15 may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court may make such
16 orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary
17 to prevent the use or employment by any person of any practice which constitutes
18 unfair competition, as defined in this chapter, or as may be necessary to restore to
19 any person in interest any money or property, real or personal, which may have
20 been acquired by means of such unfair competition. (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §
21 17203).

22 54. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to
23 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
24 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
25 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
26 2802, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal.
27 Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to
28 constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

55. 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 56. 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 and, due to a systematic business practice that cannot be justified, pursuant to the
7 applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in violation of Cal.
8 Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief,
9 pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

14 58. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unfair and
15 deceptive in that DEFENDANT's uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
16 legally required meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members
17 as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

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

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

26 61. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
27 DEFENDANT has obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFF and the
28 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages for all time worked, and

1 has deprived them of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and contract, all to the
2 detriment of these employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANT so as to allow DEFENDANT
3 to unfairly compete against competitors who comply with the law.

4 62. All the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the Industrial
5 Welfare Commission Wage Orders, the California Code of Regulations, and the California Labor
6 Code, were unlawful and in violation of public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive, and
7 unscrupulous, were deceptive, and thereby constitute unlawful, unfair and deceptive business
8 practices in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

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

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

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

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

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Pay Minimum Wages

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

(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)

66. 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.

67. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for DEFENDANT’S willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT’S failure to accurately calculate and pay minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

69. Cal. Lab. Code § 1197 provides the minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

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

71. DEFENDANT maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time they worked. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT’S uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

72. DEFENDANT’S uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of implementing a uniform policy and practice that denied accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in regards to minimum wage pay.

1 73. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
2 inaccurately calculated the amount of 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 74. 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 75. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked than they were entitled to, constituting a
12 failure to pay all earned wages.

13 76. 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 77. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
19 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are 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 corporate 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 78. 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 79. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore
6 request 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 §§ 510, 1194 and 1198)**

19 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

20 80. 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 81. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim
24 for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the
25 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees
26 for all overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday,
27 and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.
28

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

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

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

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

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

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

27
28

1 88. As a direct result of DEFENDANT’s unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
2 the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive full
3 compensation for overtime worked.

4 89. Cal. Lab. Code § 515 sets out various categories of employees who are exempt
5 from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to the
6 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Further, PLAINTIFF and the
7 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were 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 himself and the CALIFORNIA CLASS based on
10 DEFENDANT’s violations of non- negotiable, non-waivable rights provided by the State of
11 California.

12 90. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been paid less for overtime worked that they are entitled to,
14 constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

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

21 92. By virtue of DEFENDANT’s unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
22 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all
23 overtime worked by these employees, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
24 CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are
25 presently unknown to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

26 93. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
27 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under compensated for all overtime worked.
28 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross

1 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice
2 and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay
3 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked.

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

12 95. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore
13 request recovery of all unpaid wages, including overtime wages, according to proof, interest,
14 statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a
15 sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent
16 minimum and/or overtime compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS
17 Members who have terminated their employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor
18 Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these employees would also be entitled to waiting time
19 penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful,
21 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 all Defendants)**

5 96. 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 97. 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
16 meal breaks prior to their fifth (5th) hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
17 records. Further, DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
18 Members with a second off-duty meal period in some workdays in which these employees were
19 required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other
20 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation
21 and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

22 98. 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 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.

1 99. 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 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

6 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

8 100. 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.

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

25 102. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable
26 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
27 who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, one
28

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

3 103. 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,
5 and 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 all Defendants)**

10 104. 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 Complaint.

12 105. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with an
13 “accurate itemized” statement in writing showing:

- 14 a. Gross wages earned,
- 15 b. (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose
16 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment
17 of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of
18 the Industrial Welfare Commission,
- 19 c. the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
20 is paid on a piece-rate basis,
- 21 d. all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee
22 may be aggregated and shown as one item,
- 23 e. net wages earned,
- 24 f. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
- 25 g. the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by
26 January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number of an
27 employee identification number other than social security number may be shown
28 on the itemized statement,

- 1 h. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
2 i. all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
3 number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

4 106. When DEFENDANT did not accurately record PLAINTIFF's and other
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' wages, and missed meal and rest breaks, and separately
6 compensated meal and rest periods, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226 in that
7 DEFENDANT failed to provide an accurate wage statement in writing that properly and
8 accurately itemizes all wages, and missed meal and rest periods and reporting time wages owed
9 to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and thereby also failed to
10 set forth the correct wages earned by the employees.

11 107. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code
12 § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
13 CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct
14 wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which were not
15 properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult to estimate.
16 Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS may elect to recover
17 liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation
18 occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period
19 pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no
20 event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member
21 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

22 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

24 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 203)**

25 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

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

1 109. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

2 As used in this article:

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

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

9 110. Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides, in relevant part, that "If an employer discharges
10 an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable
11 immediately."

12 111. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

13 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
14 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
15 thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention
16 to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.
17 Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a
18 72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and
19 designates a mailing address. The date of the mailing shall constitute the date of payment
20 for purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of
21 quitting.

22 112. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF's or any CALIFORNIA CLASS
23 Members' employment contract.

24 113. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

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

114. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
terminated, and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of wages to these employees who were
underpaid for minimum wage and/or overtime wage, and/or missed meal and rest breaks, as
required by law.

~~115.~~ Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of himself and the
members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS whose employment has terminated, PLAINTIFF demand
up to thirty (30) days of pay as penalty for not paying all wages due at time of termination for all

1 employees who terminated employment during the CLASS PERIOD and demand an accounting
2 and payment of all wages due, plus interest and statutory costs as allowed by law.

3 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **Failure To Reimburse Employees For Required Expenses**

5 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

6 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

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

10 117. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

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

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

4 119. PLAINTIFF therefore demands reimbursement on behalf of the members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS for expenditures or losses incurred in the discharge their job duties and
6 on behalf of DEFENDANT, or his/her obedience to the directions of DEFENDANT, with interest
7 at the statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

8 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

10 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§2698 et seq.)**

11 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF against all Defendants)**

12 120. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth
13 herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

14 121. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state labor
15 laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who does so as the proxy or agent of the state's
16 labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under PAGA is fundamentally
17 a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to benefit private parties. The
18 purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution, but to create a means of "deputizing"
19 citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California
20 Legislature specified that "it was ... in the public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as
21 private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." (Stats. 2003, ch.
22 906, § 1). Accordingly, PAGA claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

23 122. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the
24 requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act,
25 bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to themselves and
26 all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT and classified as non-
27 exempt employees in California during the time period of February 10, 2021 until the present (the
28 "AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES").

- c. An order requiring DEFENDANT to pay all overtime wages and all sums unlawfully withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and
- d. Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANT's ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANT's violations due to PLAINTIFF and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA 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.

3. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES: Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004;

///

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

4. 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: April 18, 2022

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: 
Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: April 18, 2022

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: 
Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

EXHIBIT 1



ZAKAY LAW GROUP

A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

Client #45801

February 10, 2022

**Via Online Filing to LWDA and Certified Mail to Defendant
Labor and Workforce Development Agency**
Online Filing

TITAN WORKFORCE

c/o DAVID WALTER SCHLENZ

114 N. Sunrise Ave., Suite B-2

Roseville, CA 95661

Sent via Certified Mail and Return Receipt No. 7021 2720 0000 9972 6037

Re: Notice of Violations of California Labor Code Sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1199, 2802, 2804, and Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.5

Dear Sir/Madam:

Our offices represent Plaintiff ALAN CARRILLO RODRIGUEZ (“Plaintiff”), and other aggrieved employees in a proposed lawsuit against Defendant TITAN WORKFORCE (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from August of 2021 to November of 2021 as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to payment of all wages and the legally required meal and rest breaks and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for all of their time worked, and for all of their meal breaks and rest breaks. Further, Defendant failed to timely pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for earned wages.

As a consequence, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to fully compensate him and other similarly situated and aggrieved employees, for all earned wages and failed to provide California-compliant meal and rest breaks and accurate wage statements. Accordingly, Plaintiff contends that Defendant’s conduct violated Labor Code sections §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1199, 2802, 2804, and applicable wage orders, and is therefore actionable pursuant to section 2698 *et seq.*

Plaintiff seeks to represent a group of aggrieved employees defined as all non-exempt and exempt employees who worked for Defendant in California during the relevant claim period.

A true and correct copy of the proposed Complaint is attached hereto. The Complaint (i) identifies the alleged violations, (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (iii) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (iv) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to the Plaintiff, and (v) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendant, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

To the extent that entities and/or individuals are named and charged with violations of the Labor Code—making them liable on an individual basis as permitted by numerous Labor Code Sections including, but not limited to 558, 558.1, and 1197.1—Plaintiff reserves any and all rights to add, substitute, or change the name of employer entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations at issue.

Any further amendments and changes to this notice shall relate back to the date of this notice. Consequently, Defendant is on notice that Plaintiff continues his investigation, with the full intent to amend and/or change this notice, to add any undiscovered violations of any of the provisions of the California Labor Code—to the extent that are applicable to this case—and to change and/or add the identities of any entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations contained herein.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with the Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2695, *et seq.* The lawsuit consists of other aggrieved employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims as alleged in the Complaint, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Act of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all aggrieved California employees.

Your earliest response to this notice is appreciated. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and address.

Sincerely,



Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for Plaintiff

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 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
shani@zakaylaw.com
jackland@zakaylaw.com
julieann@zakaylaw.com

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
Eduardo Garcia (State Bar #290572)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292
Facsimile: (619) 599-8291
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
egarcia@jcl-lawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff ALAN CARRILLO RODRIGUEZ

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN

ALAN CARRILLO RODRIGUEZ, an individual, on behalf of himself and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

TITAN WORKFORCE, a California Corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

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

DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203; and, 8) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE §2802.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

THE PARTIES

1. Defendant TITAN WORKFORCE (“DEFENDANT”) is a California corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business in the state of California, owns, operates, and/or manages construction services in the residential and commercial construction industry throughout the county of San Joaquin.

2. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary, partnership, associate or otherwise of DEFENDANT DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these DEFENDANT by such fictitious names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that the DEFENDANT named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, (hereinafter collectively “DEFENDANTS” and/or “DEFENDANT”) are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

3. The agents, servants, and/or employees of the DEFENDANT and each of them acting on behalf of the DEFENDANT acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as the agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendant, and personally participated in the conduct alleged herein on behalf of the DEFENDANT with respect to the conduct alleged herein. Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other DEFENDANT and

1 all DEFENDANT are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the
3 Defendant's agents, servants and/or employees.

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

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

15 6. PLAINTIFF has been employed by DEFENDANT in California from August of
16 2021 to November of 2021 and at all times has been classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt
17 employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and
18 payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

19 7. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class,
20 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and
21 classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period
22 beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined
23 by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of the
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

25 8. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a CALIFORNIA
26 CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses incurred during
27 the CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice which failed to
28 lawfully compensate these employees. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice alleged

1 herein was an unlawful, unfair and deceptive business practice whereby DEFENDANT retained
2 and continues to retain wages due PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
3 CLASS. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction
4 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and the
5 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically injured by
6 DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable
7 relief.

8 9. DEFENDANT's uniform policies and practices alleged herein were unlawful,
9 unfair, and deceptive business practices whereby DEFENDANT retained and continues to retain
10 wages due PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

11 10. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an
12 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 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

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

26 **THE CONDUCT**

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

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

18 **A. Meal Period Violations**

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

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

5 15. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work
6 requirements and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off-
8 duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and
9 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required from time to time to perform work as
10 ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a
11 meal break. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and
12 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which
13 these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work from time to
14 time. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
15 Members does not qualify for limited and narrowly construed "on-duty" meal period exception.
16 When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
17 Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call. PLAINTIFF and other
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional
19 compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

20 **B. Rest Period Violations**

21 16. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were also required from time to time to work in excess of four
23 (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work
24 requirements and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons these
25 employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked
26 of at least two (2) to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten
27 (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and
28 a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10)

1 hours or more from time to time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and
2 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and/or
3 on call. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one-
4 hour wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANT's
5 inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to
6 time denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

7 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

19 18. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to use their personal cell phones, personal vehicles, and
21 personal expenses for the purchase of tools as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as
22 employees for DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were
23 often required to use their personal vehicles to drive between different job sites and were required
24 to use their personal cell phones to communicate with project managers. Additionally,
25 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to incur personal expenses
26 as a result of purchasing tools in order to perform work-related tasks for DEFENDANT. But for
27 the use of their own personal cell phones, personal vehicles, and personal expenses for the
28 purchase of tools, PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members could not complete their

1 essential job duties. Additionally, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members often
2 incurred personal expenses in the line of business that were required to complete their essential
3 job duties. However, DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for their use of their personal cell phones, personal vehicles,
5 and personal expenses for the purchase of tools. As a result, in the course of their employment
6 with DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred
7 unreimbursed business expenses, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal
8 cellular phones, personal vehicles, and personal expenses for the purchase of tools, all on behalf
9 of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

10 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

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

27 21. DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

1 Specifically, DEFENDANT failed to include the correct total number of hours worked on the
2 wage statements.

3 22. As a result, DEFENDANT issued PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements that violate Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further,
5 DEFENDANT's violations are knowing and intentional, were not isolated or due to an
6 unintentional payroll error due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

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

8 23. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT failed and
9 continue to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
10 CLASS for all hours worked.

11 24. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
12 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform post-shift work,
13 including but not limited to, cleaning up the job sites after shifts, and spending time under
14 DEFENDANT's control for which he was not compensated. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and
15 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to have to work while off-the-clock.

16 25. DEFENDANT directed benefited from the uncompensated off-the-clock work
17 performed by PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

18 26. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, protocols, applications,
19 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

21 27. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
22 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to
23 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
24 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed, including cleaning up after shifts.

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

27 29. DEFENDANT's policies and practices deprived PLAINTIFF and the other
28 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS of all minimum, regular, overtime, and double time wages

1 owed for the off-the-clock work activities. Because PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS typically worked over 40 hours in a workweek, and more than eight (8)
3 hours per day, DEFENDANT's policies and practices also deprived them of overtime pay.

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

6 31. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
7 forfeited wages due them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT's direction, control and benefit
8 for the time spent working while off-the-clock. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice to
9 not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all hours worked
10 in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

11 **F. Regular Rate Violation – Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums, and**
12 **Sick Pay**

13 32. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and
14 continue to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS
15 members for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and
16 sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members forfeited wages
17 due them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime and double time
18 rates, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and
19 practice to not pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS members the correct rate for all overtime and
20 double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay in accordance with applicable
21 law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

22 33. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times
23 their "regular rate of pay."

24 34. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
25 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a
26 matter of company policy, practice and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to
27 compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS at the correct rate
28 of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay.

1 This uniform policy and practice of DEFENDANT is intended to purposefully avoid the payment
2 of the correct overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period premiums, and sick
3 pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain an
4 unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable tolling
5 operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS members against DEFENDANT, the
6 CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

7 **G. Unlawful Rounding Violations**

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

20 36. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system and unlawful
21 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' time
22 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANTS' unlawful rounding
23 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work
24 as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an
25 off-duty meal break. Additionally, DEFENDANTS' unlawful rounding policy and practice
26 caused PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work as ordered by
27 DEFENDANTS for more than ten (10) hours during a shift without receiving a second off-duty
28 meal break.

1 **H. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

2 37. PLAINTIFF brings the First through Eighth Causes of Action as a class action
3 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 on behalf of all of DEFENDANT’s current
4 and former non-exempt California employees (“CALIFORNIA CLASS”) during the period
5 beginning four years prior to the filing of the Complaint and ending on a date determined by the
6 Court (“CLASS PERIOD”).

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

13 39. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
14 impractical.

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

- 24 a. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant meal period policies and
25 practices;
26 b. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant rest period policies and
27 practices;
28

- 1 c. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
- 2 Members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
- 3 d. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
- 4 Members accurate overtime wages;
- 5 e. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
- 6 Members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
- 7 f. Whether DEFENDANT failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA
- 8 CLASS Members for required business expenses;
- 9 g. Whether DEFENDANT issued legally compliant wage statements;
- 10 h. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
- 11 failing to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
- 12 CLASS for all time worked;
- 13 i. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
- 14 failing to record all meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and other
- 15 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit
- 16 of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to
- 17 permit this work;
- 18 j. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition in violation of the
- 19 UCL, by failing to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
- 20 CALIFORNIA CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

21 41. PLAINTIFF is a member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as
22 a result of DEFENDANT’s conduct and actions alleged herein.

23 42. PLAINTIFF’s claims are typical of the claims of the class, and PLAINTIFF has
24 the same interests as the other members of the class.

25 43. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

27 44. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action
28 litigation.

1 45. Further, PLAINTIFF's interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the
2 interests of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 52. 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
15 may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court may make such
16 orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary
17 to prevent the use or employment by any person of any practice which constitutes
18 unfair competition, as defined in this chapter, or as may be necessary to restore to
19 any person in interest any money or property, real or personal, which may have
20 been acquired by means of such unfair competition. (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §
21 17203).

22 53. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to
23 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
24 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
25 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
26 2802, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal.
27 Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to
28 constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

54. 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 55. 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 and, due to a systematic business practice that cannot be justified, pursuant to the
7 applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in violation of Cal.
8 Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief,
9 pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

14 57. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unfair and
15 deceptive in that DEFENDANT's uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
16 legally required meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members
17 as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

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

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

26 60. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
27 DEFENDANT has obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFF and the
28 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages for all time worked, and

1 has deprived them of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and contract, all to the
2 detriment of these employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANT so as to allow DEFENDANT
3 to unfairly compete against competitors who comply with the law.

4 61. All the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the Industrial
5 Welfare Commission Wage Orders, the California Code of Regulations, and the California Labor
6 Code, were unlawful and in violation of public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive, and
7 unscrupulous, were deceptive, and thereby constitute unlawful, unfair and deceptive business
8 practices in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

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

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

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

25
26
27
28 ///

1 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

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

5 65. 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 66. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim
9 for DEFENDANT’S willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the
10 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT’S failure to accurately calculate
11 and pay minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

14 68. Cal. Lab. Code § 1197 provides the minimum wage for employees fixed by the
15 commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than
16 the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

17 69. Cal. Lab. Code § 1194 establishes an employee’s right to recover unpaid wages,
18 including minimum wage compensation and interest thereon, together with the costs of suit.

19 70. DEFENDANT maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the
20 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time they
21 worked. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT’S uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and
22 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

24 71. DEFENDANT’S uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
25 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of
26 implementing a uniform policy and practice that denied accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF
27 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in regards to minimum wage pay.
28

1 72. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
2 inaccurately calculated the amount of 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 73. 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 74. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked than they were entitled to, constituting a
12 failure to pay all earned wages.

13 75. 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 76. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
19 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are 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 corporate 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 77. 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 78. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore
6 request 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 §§ 510, 1194 and 1198)**

19 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

20 79. 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 80. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim
24 for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the
25 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees
26 for all overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday,
27 and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.
28

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

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

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

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

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

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

27
28

1 87. As a direct result of DEFENDANT’s unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
2 the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive full
3 compensation for overtime worked.

4 88. Cal. Lab. Code § 515 sets out various categories of employees who are exempt
5 from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to the
6 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Further, PLAINTIFF and the
7 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were 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 himself and the CALIFORNIA CLASS based on
10 DEFENDANT’s violations of non- negotiable, non-waivable rights provided by the State of
11 California.

12 89. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been paid less for overtime worked that they are entitled to,
14 constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

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

21 91. By virtue of DEFENDANT’s unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
22 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all
23 overtime worked by these employees, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
24 CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are
25 presently unknown to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

26 92. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
27 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under compensated for all overtime worked.
28 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross

1 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice
2 and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay
3 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked.

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

12 94. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore
13 request recovery of all unpaid wages, including overtime wages, according to proof, interest,
14 statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a
15 sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent
16 minimum and/or overtime compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS
17 Members who have terminated their employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor
18 Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these employees would also be entitled to waiting time
19 penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful,
21 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 all Defendants)**

5 95. 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 96. 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
16 meal breaks prior to their fifth (5th) hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business
17 records. Further, DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
18 Members with a second off-duty meal period in some workdays in which these employees were
19 required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other
20 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation
21 and in accordance with DEFENDANT’s strict corporate policy and practice.

22 97. 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 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.

1 98. 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 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

6 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

8 99. 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.

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

25 101. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable
26 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
27 who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, one
28

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

3 102. 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,
5 and 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 all Defendants)**

10 103. 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 Complaint.

12 104. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with an
13 “accurate itemized” statement in writing showing:

- 14 a. Gross wages earned,
- 15 b. (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose
16 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment
17 of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of
18 the Industrial Welfare Commission,
- 19 c. the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
20 is paid on a piece-rate basis,
- 21 d. all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee
22 may be aggregated and shown as one item,
- 23 e. net wages earned,
- 24 f. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
- 25 g. the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by
26 January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number of an
27 employee identification number other than social security number may be shown
28 on the itemized statement,

- 1 h. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
2 i. all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
3 number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

4 105. When DEFENDANT did not accurately record PLAINTIFF's and other
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' wages, and missed meal and rest breaks, and separately
6 compensated meal and rest periods, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226 in that
7 DEFENDANT failed to provide an accurate wage statement in writing that properly and
8 accurately itemizes all wages, and missed meal and rest periods and reporting time wages owed
9 to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and thereby also failed to
10 set forth the correct wages earned by the employees.

11 106. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code
12 § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
13 CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct
14 wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which were not
15 properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult to estimate.
16 Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS may elect to recover
17 liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation
18 occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period
19 pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no
20 event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member
21 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

22 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

24 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 203)**

25 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

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

1 108. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

2 As used in this article:

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

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

9 109. Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides, in relevant part, that "If an employer discharges
10 an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable
11 immediately."

12 110. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

13 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
14 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
15 thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention
16 to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.
17 Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a
18 72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and
19 designates a mailing address. The date of the mailing shall constitute the date of payment
20 for purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of
21 quitting.

22 111. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF's or any CALIFORNIA CLASS
23 Members' employment contract.

24 112. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

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

113. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
terminated, and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of wages to these employees who were
underpaid for minimum wage and/or overtime wage, and/or missed meal and rest breaks, as
required by law.

114. Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of himself and the
members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS whose employment has terminated, PLAINTIFF demand
up to thirty (30) days of pay as penalty for not paying all wages due at time of termination for all

1 employees who terminated employment during the CLASS PERIOD and demand an accounting
2 and payment of all wages due, plus interest and statutory costs as allowed by law.

3 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **Failure To Reimburse Employees For Required Expenses**

5 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

6 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

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

10 116. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

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

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

4 118. PLAINTIFF therefore demands reimbursement on behalf of the members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS for expenditures or losses incurred in the discharge their job duties and
6 on behalf of DEFENDANT, or his/her obedience to the directions of DEFENDANT, with interest
7 at the statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

8 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

11 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

22 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 23 a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth
24 Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant
25 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- 26 b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory
27 damages for overtime compensation and separately owed rest periods, due to
28 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the

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

- 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.
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: February 10, 2022

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: 
Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: February 10, 2022

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: 
Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

Titan Workforce
 c/o David Walter Schlenz
 114. N. Sunrise AVE., St. B-2
 Roseville, CA 95661



9590 9402 6815 1074 9790 05

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7021 2720 0000 9972 6037

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

- Agent
- Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? Yes
 If YES, enter delivery address below: No

Carillo Paga 2.10.22 (1002-293)

3. Service Type

- Adult Signature
- Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
- Certified Mail®
- Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
- Collect on Delivery
- Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
- Priority Mail Express®
- Registered Mail™
- Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
- Signature Confirmation™
- Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

Mail Restricted Delivery (00)