

SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

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

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

6/26/2025 2:19:05 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By M. Cruz, Deputy Clerk

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

VOLUME SERVICES, INC., a Delaware corporation; SODEXO, INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

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

CASEY ADLER and CODY URQUHART, individuals, on behalf of themselves, and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,

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

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

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

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

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

The name and address of the court is:

(El nombre y dirección de la corte es): San Diego Superior Court

North County Regional Center - 325 South Melrose Drive Vista, CA 92081

CASE NUMBER:
(Número del Caso):

25CU033941N

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:

(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

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

DATE: 6/27/2025

(Fecha)

Clerk, by

(Secretario)

M. Cruz

M. Cruz

, Deputy

(Adjunto)

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

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

[SEAL]



NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

1. ☐ as an individual defendant.

2. ☐ as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):

3. ☐ on behalf of (specify):

under: ☐ CCP 416.10 (corporation)

☐ CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation)

☐ CCP 416.40 (association or partnership)

☐ other (specify):

☐ CCP 416.60 (minor)

☐ CCP 416.70 (conservatee)

☐ CCP 416.90 (authorized person)

4. ☐ by personal delivery on (date):

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)

shani@zakaylaw.com

Eden Zakay (State Bar #339536)

eden@zakaylaw.com

Jaclyn Joyce (State Bar #285124)

jaclyn@zakaylaw.com

5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600

San Diego, CA 92121

Telephone: (619) 255-9047

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)

jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com

Perssia Razma (State Bar #351398)

prazma@jcl-lawfirm.com

5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600

San Diego, CA 92121

Telephone: (619) 599-8292

Attorneys for PLAINTIFFS

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

CASEY ADLER and CODY URQUHART,
individuals, on behalf of themselves, and on
behalf of all persons similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

VOLUME SERVICES, INC., a Delaware
corporation; SODEXO, INC., a Delaware
corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Superior Court of California,

County of San Diego

6/26/2025 2:19:05 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court

By M. Cruz, Deputy Clerk

Case No: 25CU033941N

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

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

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

15 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

16 PLAINTIFFS CASEY ADLER (“Plaintiff Adler”) and CODY URQUHART (“Plaintiff
17 Urquhart”) (hereinafter collectively, “PLAINTIFFS”), individuals, on behalf of themselves and all
18 other similarly situated current and former employees, allege on information and belief, except for
19 their own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

20 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

21 1. Defendant VOLUME SERVICES, INC. (“Defendant Volume Services”) is a
22 Delaware corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to
23 conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

24 2. Defendant SODEXO, INC. (“Defendant Sodexo”) is a Delaware corporation that at
25 all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular
26 business throughout California.

27 3. Defendant Volume Services and Defendant Sodexo are the joint employers of
28 PLAINTIFFS as evidenced by the documents issued to PLAINTIFFS, by the company
PLAINTIFFS performed work for respectively, and as these entities each exerted control over the
hours, wages and/or working conditions of PLAINTIFFS, and are therefore jointly responsible as
employers for the conduct alleged herein as “DEFENDANTS.”

4. DEFENDANTS own and operate a food and beverage service provider company in
California, including in the County of Los Angeles, where PLAINTIFFS worked.

1 5. Plaintiff Adler has been employed by DEFENDANTS in California since 2016, as
2 a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest
3 periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

4 6. Plaintiff Urquhart has been employed by DEFENDANTS in California since April
5 of 2021, as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required
6 meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

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

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

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

1 10. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
2 partnership, associate or otherwise of DEFENDANTS DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently
3 unknown to PLAINTIFFS who therefore sue these DEFENDANTS by such fictitious names
4 pursuant to California Civil Procedure Code Section 474. PLAINTIFFS will seek leave to amend
5 this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of DEFENDANTS DOES 1 through 50,
6 inclusive, when they are ascertained. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe, and based upon that
7 information and belief allege, that the DEFENDANTS named in this Complaint, including
8 DEFENDANTS DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of
9 the events and happenings that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

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

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

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

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

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

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

THE CONDUCT

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

12 **A. Meal Period Violations**

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

26 20. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work
27 schedules and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFFS and other
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS members are from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off-duty

1 meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFFS and other
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS members are required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for
3 more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further,
4 DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS members with a
5 second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees are required by
6 DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by
7 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members does not qualify for the limited and
8 narrowly construed “on-duty” meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods,
9 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were, from time to time, required to
10 remain on premises, on duty and on call. DEFENDANTS’ failure to provide PLAINTIFFS and the
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS members with legally required meal breaks is evidenced by
12 DEFENDANTS’ business records. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and
13 DEFENDANTS’ inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA
14 CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with
15 DEFENDANTS’ strict corporate policy and practice.

16 **B. Rest Period Violations**

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

1 staffing, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were from time to time denied
2 their proper rest periods by DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers.

3 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

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

26 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

27 24. California Labor Code Section 226 requires an employer to furnish its employees an
28 accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours

1 worked, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece-rate, (4) all deductions,
2 (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the
3 name of the employee and only the last four digits of the employee's social security number or an
4 employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of
5 the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
6 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

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

15 26. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANTS, from time to time, failed to provide
16 PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with
17 California Labor Code Section 226.

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

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

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

26 29. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS required
27 PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
28 work, including but not limited to, undergoing COVID-19 health screenings, sending and receiving

1 work-related communications, clocking in and out, and laundering workplace linens. This resulted
2 in PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members having to work while off-the-clock.

3 30. DEFENDANTS directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-
4 clock work performed by PLAINTIFFS and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

5 31. DEFENDANTS controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
6 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFFS and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS
7 members.

8 32. DEFENDANTS were able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFFS and the other
9 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANTS failed to
10 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
11 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

12 33. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were non-
13 exempt employees, subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.

14 34. DEFENDANTS' policies and practices deprived PLAINTIFFS and the other
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS members of all minimum regular, overtime, and double time wages owed
16 for the off-the-clock work activities. Because PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS typically worked over forty (40) hours in a workweek, and more than eight
18 (8) hours per day, DEFENDANTS' policies and practices also deprived them of overtime pay.

19 35. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFFS' and the other
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS members' off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

21 36. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
22 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS' direction, control, and benefit
23 for the time spent working while off-the-clock, including but not limited to, undergoing COVID-
24 19 health screenings, sending and receiving work-related communications, clocking in and out, and
25 laundering workplace linens. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice to not pay
26 PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all hours worked in
27 accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

28

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

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

38. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an employee's performance.

39. The second component of PLAINTIFFS' and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members' compensation was DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary incentive program that paid PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members incentive wages based on their performance for DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by DEFENDANTS.

40. However, from time to time, when calculating the regular rate of pay in those pay periods where PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members worked overtime, double time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-discretionary bonuses, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus compensation as part of the employee's "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package. As

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

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

22 **G. Unlawful Deductions**

23 42. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, unlawfully deducted wages from
24 PLAINTIFFS’ and CALIFORNIA CLASS members’ pay without explanations and without
25 authorization to do so or notice to PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members. As a
26 result, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code Section 221.

27
28 ///

1 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

2 43. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, did not have an
3 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFFS and other members of
4 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the actual time PLAINTIFFS and other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS worked each day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal
6 and rest breaks. As a result, DEFENDANTS were able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and
7 unilaterally alter the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system for PLAINTIFFS and
8 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees for all
9 hours worked, applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and
10 missed rest breaks.

11 44. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, from
12 time to time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and
13 without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

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

22 46. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
23 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS' direction, control and benefit
24 for the time that the timekeeping system was inoperable. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and
25 practice to not pay PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all
26 hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business
27 records.

1 **I. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

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

14 48. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system and unlawful
15 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFFS' and CALIFORNIA CLASS members'
16 time being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANTS' unlawful
17 rounding policy and practice caused PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS members to
18 perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without
19 receiving an off-duty meal break.

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

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

26 50. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 201, "If an employer discharges an
27 employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately."
28 Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 202, if an employee quits his or her employment, "his

1 or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee
2 has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is
3 entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.” PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
4 members were, from time to time, not timely provided the wages earned and unpaid at the time of
5 their discharge and/or at the time of quitting, in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201
6 and 202.

7 51. As such, PLAINTIFFS demand up to thirty days of pay as penalty for not timely
8 paying all wages due at time of termination for all CALIFORNIA CLASS members whose
9 employment ended during the CLASS PERIOD.

10 **K. Sick Pay Violations**

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

19 53. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its employees
20 with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available. From time to
21 time, DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section 246 by failing to furnish
22 PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements setting forth
23 the amount of paid sick leave available.

24 **L. Tip Pooling**

25 54. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS period, pursuant to DEFENDANTS’ company
26 policies and practices, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were forced to
27 forfeit gratuities left for them by customers to DEFENDANTS’ agents who provided no service to
28 the customers that resulted in the gratuity.

1 55. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and other
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were in the “chain of service” and earned gratuities based on their
3 service for their customers. However, PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS members were
4 forced to forfeit portions of their gratuities, which said gratuities were kept by DEFENDANTS’
5 employees who were not in the chain of service from which the gratuity resulted. PLAINTIFFS and
6 other CALIFORNIA CLASS members contend that any gratuities kept by DEFENDANTS’ non-
7 service employees were illegal and in violation of California law because PLAINTIFFS and other
8 CALIFORNIA CLASS members provided the service for to whom the gratuity should have been
9 paid.

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

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

22 **M. Failure to Provide Personnel Files**

23 58. On May 19, 2025, PLAINTIFFS caused written requests via certified mail to be
24 delivered to DEFENDANTS for PLAINTIFFS’ personnel and employment records, including but
25 not limited to: (1) payroll records; (2) employment contracts; (3) itemized pay stubs; and (4)
26 PLAINTIFFS’ complete employment files.

27 59. DEFENDANTS failed to provide and/or make available to PLAINTIFFS their
28 personnel records, payroll records, employment contract, and entire employment files within thirty

1 (30) days of their requests stated above. In fact, as of the date of filing of this complaint,
2 DEFENDANTS have still failed to pay PLAINTIFFS the statutory penalty in the amount of \$750.
3 DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section 1198.5 by failing to respond and provide
4 PLAINTIFFS with their employment files. Section 1198.5 states that employees (and former
5 employees) have the right to inspect personnel records maintained by the employer “related to the
6 employee’s performance or to any grievance concerning the employee.” Employers must allow
7 inspection or copying within thirty (30) days of the request. PLAINTIFFS are now entitled to and
8 request injunctive relief to obtain compliance with California Labor Code Section 1198.5, a
9 statutory penalty, and an award of attorneys’ fees and costs for bringing this action.

10 60. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFFS, PLAINTIFFS were from time to time unable to
11 take off-duty meal and rest breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their rest and meal
12 periods. PLAINTIFFS were required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more
13 than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further,
14 DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFFS with a second off-duty meal period each workday
15 in which they were required by DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work. When
16 DEFENDANTS provided PLAINTIFFS with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFFS to remain
17 on premises, on-duty and on-call for the rest break. DEFENDANTS’ policy caused PLAINTIFFS
18 to remain on premises, on-call and on-duty during what was supposed to be their off-duty meal
19 periods. PLAINTIFFS therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks without additional compensation
20 and in accordance with DEFENDANTS’ strict corporate policy and practice. Moreover,
21 DEFENDANTS also provided PLAINTIFFS with paystubs that failed to comply with California
22 Labor Code Section 226. Further, DEFENDANTS also failed to reimburse PLAINTIFFS for
23 required business expenses related to the personal expenses incurred for the use of their personal
24 cell phones and personal vehicles, on behalf of and in furtherance of their employment with
25 DEFENDANTS. Additionally, DEFENDANTS failed to provide and/or make available to
26 PLAINTIFFS their personnel records, payroll records, employment contracts, and entire
27 employment files within (30) days of all their requests on May 19, 2025. To date, DEFENDANTS
28 have not fully paid PLAINTIFFS the minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed

1 to them, or any penalty wages owed to them under California Labor Code Section 203. The amount
2 in controversy for PLAINTIFFS individually do not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

3 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

4 61. PLAINTIFFS bring this Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFFS, and a California
5 class defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Volume Services
6 and/or Defendant Sodexo in California and classified as non-exempt employees (the
7 “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing
8 of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”).

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

16 63. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
17 impractical.

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

- 26 a. Whether DEFENDANTS maintained legally compliant meal period policies and
27 practices;
28

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

65. PLAINTIFFS are members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as a result of DEFENDANTS’ conduct and actions alleged herein.

1 66. PLAINTIFFS' claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and
2 PLAINTIFFS have the same interests as the other members of the class.

3 67. PLAINTIFFS will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

5 68. PLAINTIFFS retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action
6 litigation.

7 69. Further, PLAINTIFFS' interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the
8 interest of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

9 70. There is a strong community of interest among PLAINTIFFS and the members of
10 the CALIFORNIA CLASS to, inter alia, ensure that the combined assets of DEFENDANTS are
11 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries
12 sustained.

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

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

- 23 a. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish incompatible standards of conduct
25 for the parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and/or,
26 b. Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
27 which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other
28

1 members not party to the adjudication or substantially impair or impeded their ability
2 to protect their interests.

3 73. Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring an
4 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims arising out of the
5 conduct of DEFENDANTS.

6 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **Unlawful Business Practices**

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

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

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

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

15 76. California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”)
16 defines unfair competition as any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice. Section
17 17203 authorizes injunctive, declaratory, and/or other equitable relief with respect to unfair
18 competition as follows:

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

26 77. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS have engaged and continue to
27 engage in business practices which violate California law, including but not limited to, the
28 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226.7, 351, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
and 2802, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to
California Business and Professions Code Section 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and

1 remedy the conduct held to constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully
2 withheld.

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

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

17 80. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were also unlawful,
18 unfair, and deceptive in that DEFENDANTS' employment practices caused PLAINTIFFS and the
19 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with
20 DEFENDANTS.

21 81. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were also unfair and
22 deceptive in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
23 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members as
24 required by California Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

8 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

11 96. As a direct result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
12 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive the correct
13 minimum wage compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANTS.

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

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

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

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

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

20 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

23 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS)**

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

27 103. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
28 DEFENDANTS' willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial

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

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

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

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

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

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

24 109. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANTS
25 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
26 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members. DEFENDANTS acted in an illegal
27 attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California
28

1 Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and
2 regulations.

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

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

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

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

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

1 115. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFFS and the other
2 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were undercompensated for their time worked.
3 DEFENDANTS systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
4 nonfeasance, to not pay them for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice and
5 procedure, and DEFENDANTS perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay
6 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct overtime wages for
7 their overtime worked.

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

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

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

5 118. PLAINTIFFS 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.

8 119. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed to provide all the legally
9 required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFFS 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 PLAINTIFFS 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, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were often not
14 fully relieved of duty by DEFENDANTS for their meal periods. Additionally, DEFENDANTS'
15 failure to provide PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members with legally required
16 meal breaks prior to their fifth (5th) hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business
17 records. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS
18 members with a second off-duty meal period in some workdays in which these employees were
19 required by DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and other
20 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation and
21 in accordance with DEFENDANTS' strict corporate policy and practice.

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

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

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods

(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)

(Alleged by PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS)

122. PLAINTIFFS, 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.

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

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

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

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

6 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

8 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

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

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

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

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

employee identification number other than social security number may be shown on the itemized statement,

h. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and

i. all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

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

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

130. DEFENDANTS knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with California Labor Code Section 226(a)(1)-(9), causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult to estimate. Therefore, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS may elect to recover liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFFS and each respective member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

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

5 131. PLAINTIFFS, 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.

8 132. California Labor Code Section 200 provides that:

9 As used in this article:

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

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

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

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

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

23 135. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFFS' or any CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 members' employment contract.

25 136. California Labor Code Section 203 provides:

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

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

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

10 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

12 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

13 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS)**

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

17 140. California Labor Code Section 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:
18 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or
19 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
20 duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though
 unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to
 be unlawful.

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

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

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

14 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **Failure to Pay Statutory Gratuities**

16 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 351, *et seq.*)**

17 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS)**

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

21 144. DEFENDANTS' conduct, as set forth above, in failing to remit to non-managerial
22 employees the total proceeds of gratuities added to customers' bills constitutes a violation of
23 California Labor Code Section 351. This violation is enforceable pursuant to the California Unfair
24 Competition Law, Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code 17200 *et seq.* DEFENDANTS' conduct constitutes
25 unlawful, unfair, and/or fraudulent business acts or practices, in that DEFENDANTS have violated
26 California Labor Code Section 351 in not remitting to the non-managerial service employees the
27 total gratuities that were charged to customers.

1 145. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFFS and
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS members have been damaged in an amount according to proof at trial,
3 including the loss of gratuities to which they were entitled and seek all wages earned and due,
4 interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.

5 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

7 **(Cal. Lab. § 1198.5)**

8 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

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

12 147. Labor Code § 1198.5 states that employees (and former employees) have the right
13 to inspect personnel records maintained by the employer “related to the employee’s performance
14 or to any grievance concerning the employee.” Employers must allow inspection or copying
15 within thirty (30) days of the request.

16 148. On May 19, 2025, PLAINTIFFS caused written requests via certified mail to be
17 delivered to DEFENDANTS for PLAINTIFFS’ personnel and employment records, including but
18 not limited to: (1) payroll records; (2) employment contracts; (3) itemized pay stubs; and (4)
19 PLAINTIFFS’ complete employment files.

20 149. DEFENDANTS failed to provide and/or make available to PLAINTIFFS their
21 personnel records, payroll records, employment contract, and entire employment files within thirty
22 (30) days of their requests stated above. In fact, as of the date of filing of this complaint,
23 DEFENDANTS have still failed to pay PLAINTIFFS the statutory penalty in the amount of \$750.

24 150. PLAINTIFFS are now entitled to and request injunctive relief to obtain compliance
25 with Cal. Lab. Code Section 1198.5, a statutory penalty, and an award of attorneys’ fees and costs
26 for bringing this action.

27
28 ///

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFFS pray for a judgment against all DEFENDANTS, jointly and
3 severally, as follows:

4 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

15 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 16 a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and
17 Ninth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action
18 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382;
19 b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory
20 damages for overtime compensation due to PLAINTIFFS and the other members
21 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest
22 thereon at the statutory rate;
23 c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to California Labor Code Sections
24 226.7, 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;
25 d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in
26 which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding
28 an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for

1 violation of California Labor Code Section 226;

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

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

7 3. On the Tenth Cause of Action

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

9 b. For an injunction compelling production of Plaintiffs' employment records
10 pursuant to Labor Code §1198.5.

11 4. On all claims:

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

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

14 c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law,
15 including and pursuant to, but not limited to, California Labor Code Sections 218.5,
16 226, 246 and/or 1194.

17 DATED: June 26, 2025

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

19 By: Perssia Razma

Perssia Razma, Esq.

20 Attorney for PLAINTIFFS

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 ///

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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFFS demand a jury trial on issues triable to a jury.

DATED: June 26, 2025

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

By: Perssia Razma
Perssia Razma, Esq.
Attorney for PLAINTIFFS