

COPY

FILED

**Superior Court Of California,
Sacramento**

02/25/2019

amcsnu

**By _____, Deputy
Case Number:**

34-2019-00251220

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC
Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
3990 Old Town Avenue, Suite C204
San Diego, CA 92110
Telephone: (619)255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
Website: www.zakaylaw.com

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW-LLP

Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)
Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)
2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, CA 92037
Telephone: (858)551-1223
Facsimile: (858) 551-1232
Website: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

BY FAX

HEATHER MCINTYRE, an individual, on
behalf of herself and on behalf of all persons
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

J.J.R. ENTERPRISES, INC., 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 OVERTIME WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 510, *et seq*;
- 3) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
- 4) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
- 5) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
- 6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
- 7) VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT [LABOR CODE §§ 2698 *et seq.*]

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff Heather McIntyre (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of herself and
2 all other similarly situated current and former employees, alleges on information and
3 belief, except for her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the
4 following:

5 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

6 1. Defendant J.J.R. Enterprises, Inc. (“DEFENDANT”) is a California corporation
7 that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and
8 regular business throughout California.

9 2. DEFENDANT, doing business as “Caltronics Business Systems” sells digital
10 copiers and printers, color copiers and printers, fax and multifunctional devices, scanning
11 devices, and document management and retrieval software. DEFENDANT provides document
12 management, scanning and capture, network fax systems, document workflow, production print
13 workflow and web submission, and variable data printing solutions. DEFENDANT also offers
14 consultation and support service to federal, state, and local government, as well as provides
15 managed print services. The company was founded in 1975 and is based in Sacramento,
California.

16 3. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California as a non-exempt
17 employee entitled to overtime pay and meal and rest periods from July of 2018 to October of
18 2018. PLAINTIFF was at all times relevant mentioned herein classified by DEFENDANT as a
19 non-exempt employee paid in whole or in part on an hourly basis and received additional
20 compensation from DEFENDANT in the form of non-discretionary incentive wages. The
21 amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of
22 \$75,000.

23 4. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a California class,
24 defined as all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California
25 and classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the
26 period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of the Complaint and ending on the date as
27 determined by the Court (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD”). The amount in controversy
28

1 for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars
2 (\$5,000,000.00).

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

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

23 7. The agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants and each of them acting
24 on behalf of the Defendants acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as the
25 agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendants, and personally participated in the conduct
26 alleged herein on behalf of the Defendants with respect to the conduct alleged herein.
27 Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants and all
28 Defendants are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the
2 Defendants' agents, servants and/or employees

3
4 **THE CONDUCT**

5 8. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and continues
6 to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
7 CLASS for their overtime worked. DEFENDANT unlawfully and unilaterally failed to
8 accurately calculate wages for overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees the correct overtime
10 compensation. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
11 forfeited wages due them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime
12 rates. DEFENDANT'S uniform policy and practice to not pay the members of the
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct overtime rate for all overtime worked in accordance with
14 applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT'S business records.

15 9. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-
16 halftimes their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
17 were compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an
18 employee's performance.

19 10. The second component of PLAINTIFF'S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
20 Members' compensation was DEFENDANT'S non-discretionary incentive program that paid
21 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
22 performance for DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all
23 employees paid on an hourly basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the
24 various performance goals set by DEFENDANT. However, when calculating the regular rate of
25 pay in order to pay overtime to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members,
26 DEFENDANT failed to include the incentive compensation as part of the employees' "regular
27 rate of pay" for purposes of calculating overtime pay. Management and supervisors described
28 the incentive program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package. As

1 a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
2 CLASS Members must be included in the “regular rate of pay.” The failure to do so has resulted
3 in a systematic underpayment of overtime compensation to PLAINTIFF and other
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by DEFENDANT.

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

15 12. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also from time to time unable to take off duty meal
17 breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT
19 for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further,
20 DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a
21 second off-duty meal period each workday in which these employees were required by
22 DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS Members therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation and in
24 accordance with DEFENDANT’S strict corporate policy and practice

25 13. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, from time to time, PLAINTIFF and
26 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours
27 without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their
28 first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4)

1 hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of
2 between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10)
3 minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more. PLAINTIFF and other
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof.
5 As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
6 Members were periodically denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and
7 DEFENDANT’S managers.

8 14. When PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members worked overtime
9 in the same pay period they earned incentive wages and/or missed meal and rest breaks,
10 DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
11 CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things,
12 the correct overtime rate for overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8)
13 hours in a workday and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek, and the correct penalty payments
14 or missed meal and rest periods. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides that every employer shall
15 furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing
16 showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during
17 the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. Aside, from
18 the violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an
19 itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226 *et seq.*
20 As a result, from time to time DEFENDANT provided PLAINTIFF and the other members of
21 the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

22 15. By reason of this uniform conduct applicable to PLAINTIFF and all
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, DEFENDANT committed acts of unfair competition in
24 violation of the California Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et*
25 *seq.*(the “UCL”), by engaging in a company-wide policy and procedure which failed to
26 accurately calculate and record the correct overtime rate for the overtime worked by
27 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. The proper calculation of these
28 employees’ overtime hour rates is the DEFENDANT’S burden. As a result of DEFENDANT’S

1 intentional disregard of the obligation to meet this burden, DEFENDANT failed to properly
2 calculate and/or pay all required overtime compensation for work performed by the members of
3 the CALIFORNIA CLASS and violated the California Labor Code and regulations promulgated
4 thereunder as herein alleged.

5 16. Specifically as to PLAINTIFF’S pay, DEFENDANT provided compensation to
6 her in the form of two components. One component of PLAINTIFF’S compensation was a base
7 hourly wage. The second component of PLAINTIFF’S compensation were non-discretionary
8 incentive wages. DEFENDANT paid the incentive wages, so long as PLAINTIFF met certain
9 predefined performance requirements. PLAINTIFF met DEFENDANT’S predefined eligibility
10 performance requirements in various pay periods throughout her employment with
11 DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT paid PLAINTIFF the incentive wages. During these pay
12 periods in which PLAINTIFF was paid the non-discretionary incentive wages by
13 DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF also worked overtime for DEFENDANT, but DEFENDANT never
14 included the incentive compensation in PLAINTIFF’s regular rate of pay for the purposes of
15 calculating what should have been PLAINTIFF’s accurate overtime rate and thereby underpaid
16 PLAINTIFF for overtime worked throughout her employment with DEFENDANT. The
17 incentive compensation paid by DEFENDANT constituted wages within the meaning of the
18 California Labor Code and thereby should have been part of PLAINTIFF’S “regular rate of
19 pay.” PLAINTIFF was also from time to time unable to take off duty meal and rest breaks and
20 was not fully relieved of duty for her meal periods. PLAINTIFF was required to perform work
21 as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an
22 off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-
23 duty meal period each workday in which he was required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10)
24 hours of work. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks without additional
25 compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT’S strict corporate policy and practice.
26 DEFENDANT also provided PLAINTIFF with a paystub that failed to accurately display
27 PLAINTIFF’S correct rates of overtime pay and payments for missed meal and rest periods for
28 certain pay periods in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a). To date, DEFENDANT has not

1 fully paid PLAINTIFF the overtime compensation still owed to them or any penalty wages
2 owed to them under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF
3 individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

4 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

9 18. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
10 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANT (i) currently maintains and at all relevant times
11 maintained offices and facilities in this County and/or conducts substantial business in this
12 County, and (ii) committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against members
13 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS

14
15 **THE CALIFORNIA CLASS**

16
17 19. PLAINTIFF brings the First Cause of Action for Unfair, Unlawful and Deceptive
18 Business Practices pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the "UCL") as a Class
19 Action, pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, on behalf of a California class, defined as all
20 individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and classified
21 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
23 determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy
24 for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars
25 (\$5,000,000.00).

26 20. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA
27 CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted
28 accordingly.

1 21. The California Legislature has commanded that “all wages... ..earned by any
2 person in any employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days
3 designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays”, and further that “[a]ny work in
4 excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek .
5 . . shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay
6 for an employee.” (Lab. Code § 204 and § 510(a).) The Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC),
7 however, is statutorily authorized to “establish exemptions from the requirement that an
8 overtime rate of compensation be paid... ..for executive, administrative, and professional
9 employees, provided [inter alia] that the employee is primarily engaged in duties that meet the
10 test of the exemption, [and] customarily and regularly exercises discretion and independent
11 judgment in performing those duties...” (Lab. Code § 510(a).) Neither the PLAINTIFF nor the
12 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and/or the CALIFORNIALABOR SUB-CLASS
13 qualify for exemption from the above requirements.

14 22. DEFENDANT, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in
15 violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order
16 requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and
17 willfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT systematically failed to correctly
18 calculate and record overtime compensation for overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and the other
19 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit of this
20 work, required employees to perform this work and permitted or suffered to permit this
21 overtime work.

22 23. DEFENDANT has the legal burden to establish that each and every
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member is paid the applicable rate for all overtime worked and to
24 accurately calculate the “regular rate of pay” by including the incentive compensation that
25 PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were awarded by DEFENDANT.
26 DEFENDANT, however, as a matter of uniform and systematic policy and procedure failed to
27 have in place during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD and still fails to have in place a policy
28 or practice to ensure that each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member is paid the applicable

1 overtime rate for all overtime worked, so as to satisfy their burden. This common business
2 practice applicable to each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member can be adjudicated on a
3 class-wide basis as unlawful, unfair, and/or deceptive under Cal. Business & Professions
4 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”) as causation, damages, and reliance are not elements of this
5 claim.

6 24. At no time during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD was the compensation for
7 any member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS properly recalculated so as to compensate the
8 employee for all overtime worked at the applicable rate, as required by California Labor Code
9 §§ 204 and 510, *et seq.* At no time during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD was the
10 overtime compensation for any member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS properly recalculated so
11 as to include all earnings in the overtime compensation calculation as required by California
12 Labor Code §§ 510, *et seq.*

13 25. The CALIFORNIA CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all CALIFORNIA
14 CLASS Members is impracticable.

15 26. DEFENDANT uniformly violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA CLASS under
16 California law by:

- 17 a. Violating the California Unfair Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§
18 17200, *et seq.*, by unlawfully, unfairly and/or deceptively having in place
19 company policies, practices and procedures that failed to pay all wages due the
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS for all overtime worked, and failed to accurately record
21 the applicable rates of all overtime worked by the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- 22 b. Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the California Unfair
23 Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by unlawfully,
24 unfairly, and/or deceptively having in place a company policy, practice and
25 procedure that failed to correctly calculate overtime compensation due to
26 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- 27 c. Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the California Unfair
28 Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by failing to

1 provide mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS members; and

3 27. The Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a Class
4 Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

5 a. The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that the
6 joinder of all such persons is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as
7 a class will benefit the parties and the Court;

8 b. Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that are
9 raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS will apply
10 uniformly to every member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS;

11 c. The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims of each
12 member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all the other members
13 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, was subjected to the uniform employment
14 practices of DEFENDANT and was a non-exempt employee paid on an hourly
15 basis and paid additional non-discretionary incentive wages who was subjected
16 to the DEFENDANT’S practice and policy which failed to pay the correct rate of
17 overtime wages due to the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all overtime worked by the
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS and thereby systematically under pays overtime
19 compensation to the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic
20 injury as a result of DEFENDANT’S employment practices. PLAINTIFF and the
21 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were and are similarly or identically
22 harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive, unfair and pervasive pattern of
23 misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANT; and

24 d. The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect
25 the interest of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and has retained counsel who are
26 competent and experienced in Class Action litigation. There are no material
27 conflicts between the claims of the representative PLAINTIFF and the members
28 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that would make class certification inappropriate.

1 Counsel for the CALIFORNIA CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of all
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

3 28. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action is
4 properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

5 a. Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory
6 and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of separate actions
7 by individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS will create the risk of:

8 i. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members
9 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish incompatible
10 standards of conduct for the parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
11 and/or;

12 ii. Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA
13 CLASS which would as a practical matter be dispositive of interests of
14 the other members not party to the adjudication or substantially impair or
15 impede their ability to protect their interests.

16 b. The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS have acted or refused to act on
17 grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS, making appropriate
18 class-wide relief with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole in that
19 DEFENDANT uniformly failed to pay all wages due, including the correct
20 overtime rate, for all time worked by the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
21 as required by law;

22 i. With respect to the First Cause of Action, the final relief on behalf of the
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS sought does not relate exclusively to restitution
24 because through this claim PLAINTIFF seek declaratory relief holding
25 that the DEFENDANT’S policy and practices constitute unfair
26 competition, along with declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and incidental
27 equitable relief as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct
28 declared to constitute unfair competition;

1 c. Common questions of law and fact exist as to the members of the CALIFORNIA
2 CLASS, with respect to the practices and violations of California law as listed
3 above, and predominate over any question affecting only individual
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, and a Class Action is superior to other
5 available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy,
6 including consideration of:

7 i. The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in
8 individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions in
9 that the substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to
10 recover the relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the
11 individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members when compared to the
12 substantial expense and burden of individual prosecution of this
13 litigation;

14 ii. Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation
15 that would create the risk of:

16 1. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
17 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, which would establish
18 incompatible standards of conduct for the DEFENDANT; and/or;

19 2. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS would as a practical matter be dispositive
21 of the interests of the other members not parties to the
22 adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to
23 protect their interests;

24 iii. In the context of wage litigation, because a substantial number of
25 individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting their
26 legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANT, which may
27 adversely affect an individual's job with DEFENDANT or with a
28

1 subsequent employer, the Class Action is the only means to assert their
2 claims through a representative; and

3 iv. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and
4 efficient adjudication of this litigation because class treatment will
5 obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative litigation that is
6 likely to result in the absence of certification of this action pursuant to
7 Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

8 29. The Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant
9 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

10 a. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS
11 predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA CLASS
12 Members because the DEFENDANT’S employment practices are uniform and
13 systematically applied with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

14 b. A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient
15 adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS because
16 in the context of employment litigation a substantial number of individual
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting their rights individually
18 out of fear of retaliation or adverse impact on their employment;

19 c. The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that it is
20 impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS before the Court;

21 d. PLAINTIFF, and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, will not be able to
22 obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a
23 Class Action;

24 e. There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable
25 relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and other
26 improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and
27 injuries which DEFENDANT’S actions have inflicted upon the CALIFORNIA
28 CLASS;

- 1 f. There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
2 DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- 4 g. DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS, thereby making final class-wide relief appropriate with
6 respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole;
- 7 h. The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are readily ascertainable from the
8 business records of DEFENDANT; and
- 9 i. Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring an
10 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims
11 arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to the members of the
12 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

13 30. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and
14 identify by job title each of DEFENDANT’S employees who as have been systematically,
15 intentionally and uniformly subjected to DEFENDANT’S company policy, practices and
16 procedures as herein alleged. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the Complaint to include
17 any additional job titles of similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

18
19 **THE CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

20
21 31. PLAINTIFF further brings the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth causes of
22 Action on behalf of a California sub-class, defined as all members of the CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS”) at
24 any time during the period three (3) years prior to the filing of the complaint and ending on the
25 date as determined by the Court (the “CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD”)
26 pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382. The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim
27 of CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is under five million dollars
28 (\$5,000,000.00).

1 32. DEFENDANT, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in
2 violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order
3 requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and
4 willfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT failed to correctly calculate overtime
5 compensation for the overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit of this
7 work, required employees to perform this work and permitted or suffered to permit this
8 overtime work. DEFENDANT have uniformly denied these CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
9 CLASS Members overtime wages at the correct amount to which these employees are entitled
10 in order to unfairly cheat the competition and unlawfully profit. To the extent equitable tolling
11 operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against DEFENDANT, the
12 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

13 33. DEFENDANT maintain records from which the Court can ascertain and identify
14 by name and job title, each of DEFENDANT’S employees who have been systematically,
15 intentionally and uniformly subjected to DEFENDANT’S company policy, practices and
16 procedures as herein alleged. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the complaint to include any
17 additional job titles of similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

18 34. The CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all
19 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is impracticable

20 35. Common questions of law and fact exist as to members of the CALIFORNIA
21 LABOR SUB-CLASS, including, but not limited, to the following:

- 22 a. Whether DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to correctly calculate and pay overtime
23 compensation to members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS in
24 violation of the California Labor Code and California regulations and the
25 applicable California Wage Order;
- 26 b. Whether the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are entitled
27 to overtime compensation for overtime worked under the overtime pay
28 requirements of California law;

- 1 c. Whether DEFENDANT failed to accurately record the applicable overtime rates
- 2 for all overtime worked PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
- 3 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;
- 4 d. Whether DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of
- 5 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with legally required uninterrupted
- 6 thirty (30) minute meal breaks and rest periods;
- 7 e. Whether DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of
- 8 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with accurate itemized wage
- 9 statements;
- 10 f. Whether DEFENDANT has engaged in unfair competition by the above-listed
- 11 conduct;
- 12 g. The proper measure of damages and penalties owed to the members of the
- 13 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; and
- 14 h. Whether DEFENDANT’S conduct was willful.

15 36. DEFENDANT, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, failed to
16 accurately calculate overtime compensation for the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
17 Members and failed to provide accurate records of the applicable overtime rates for the
18 overtime worked by these employees. All of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
19 Members, including PLAINTIFF, were non-exempt employees who were paid on an hourly
20 basis by DEFENDANT according to uniform and systematic company procedures as alleged
21 herein above. This business practice was uniformly applied to each and every member of the
22 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and therefore, the propriety of this conduct can be
23 adjudicated on a class-wide basis.

24 37. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
25 under California law by:

- 26 a. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, *et seq.*, by failing to accurately pay
- 27 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS the
- 28

1 correct overtime pay for which DEFENDANT is liable pursuant to Cal. Lab.
2 Code § 1194 & § 1198;

3 b. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF
4 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with all legally required
5 off-duty, uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal breaks and the legally required
6 rest breaks;

7 c. Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 226, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and the
8 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with an accurate itemized
9 statement in writing showing all accurate and applicable overtime rates in effect
10 during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each
11 overtime rate by the employee;

12 d. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and/or 203, which provides that when an
13 employee is discharged or quits from employment, the employer must pay the
14 employee all wages due without abatement, by failing to tender full payment
15 and/or restitution of wages owed or in the manner required by California law to
16 the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS who have terminated
17 their employment.

18 38. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a
19 Class Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

20 a. The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so
21 numerous that the joinder of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members
22 is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as a class will benefit the
23 parties and the Court;

24 b. Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that are
25 raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
26 CLASS and will apply uniformly to every member of the CALIFORNIA
27 LABOR SUB-CLASS;

- 1 c. The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims of each
2 member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all the
3 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABORSUB-CLASS, was a non-exempt
4 employee paid on an hourly basis and paid additional non-discretionary incentive
5 wages who was subjected to the DEFENDANT’S practice and policy which
6 failed to pay the correct rate of overtime wages due to the CALIFORNIA
7 LABOR SUB-CLASS for all overtime worked. PLAINTIFF sustained economic
8 injury as a result of DEFENDANT’S employment practices. PLAINTIFF and the
9 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were and are similarly or
10 identically harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive, unfair and pervasive pattern
11 of misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANT; and
- 12 d. The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect
13 the interest of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and has retained
14 counsel who are competent and experienced in Class Action litigation. There are
15 no material conflicts between the claims of the representative PLAINTIFF and
16 the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS that would make class
17 certification inappropriate. Counsel for the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
18 will vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
19 Members.

20 39. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action is
21 properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 22 a. Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory
23 and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of separate actions
24 by individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS will create
25 the risk of:
- 26 i. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members
27 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would establish
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

incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; or

ii. Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would as a practical matter be dispositive of interests of the other members not party to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests.

b. The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, making appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole in that DEFENDANT uniformly failed to pay all wages due, including the correct overtime rate, for all overtime worked by the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as required by law;

c. Common questions of law and fact predominate as to the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, with respect to the practices and violations of California Law as listed above, and predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, and a Class Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

i. The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions in that the substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to recover the relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members when compared to the substantial expense and burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;

ii. Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation that would create the risk of:

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

1. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the DEFENDANT; and/or,

2. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS would as a practical matter be dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests;

iii. In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid asserting their legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANT, which may adversely affect an individual’s job with DEFENDANT or with a subsequent employer, the Class Action is the only means to assert their claims through a representative; and,

iv. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because class treatment will obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative litigation that is likely to result in the absence of certification of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

40. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

a. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members;

b. A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS because in the context of employment litigation a substantial number of

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

- individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid asserting their rights individually out of fear of retaliation or adverse impact on their employment;
- c. The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS before the Court;
 - d. PLAINTIFF, and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a Class Action;
 - e. There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and other improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries which DEFENDANT’S actions have inflicted upon the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;
 - f. There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for the injuries sustained;
 - g. DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, thereby making final class-wide relief appropriate with respect to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole;
 - h. The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are readily ascertainable from the business records of DEFENDANT. The CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS consists of all CALIFORNIA CLASS Members classified as non-exempt employees during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD; and
 - i. Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring an efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims

1 arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to the members of the
2 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

3
4 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **UNLAWFUL BUSINESS PRACTICES**

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

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

8 41. 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 42. DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. And Prof.
12 Code § 17021.

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

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

21 44. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to
22 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
23 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
24 including Sections 204, 206.5, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1198, for which this Court should
25 issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may
26 be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to constitute unfair competition, including
27 restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

7 46. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’S practices were deceptive and
8 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT’S uniform policy and practice failed to pay PLAINTIFF, and
9 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, wages due for overtime worked, failed to
10 accurately to record the applicable rate of all overtime worked, and failed to provide the
11 required amount of overtime compensation due to a systematic miscalculation of the overtime
12 rate that cannot be justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare
13 Commission requirements in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this
14 Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203,
15 including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

20 48. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’S practices were also unfair and
21 deceptive in that DEFENDANT’S uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
22 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

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

28

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

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

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

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

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

24 55. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no plain,
25 speedy and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business practices
26 of DEFENDANT. Further, the practices herein alleged presently continue to occur unabated. As
27 a result of the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein, PLAINTIFF and the
28 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer

1 irreparable legal and economic harm unless DEFENDANT is restrained from continuing to
2 engage in these unlawful and unfair business practices.

3 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME COMPENSATION**
5 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 510, 1194 and 1198)**

6 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against ALL**
7 **Defendants)**

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

11 57. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
12 bring a claim for DEFENDANT'S willful and intentional violations of the California Labor
13 Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT'S failure to
14 accurately calculate the applicable rates for all overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other
15 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and DEFENDANT'S failure to properly
16 compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for overtime worked,
17 including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or forty (40) hours in
any workweek.

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

20 59. Cal. Lab. Code § 510 further provides that employees in California shall not be
21 employed more than eight (8) hours per workday and/or more than forty (40) hours per
22 workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amount
23 specified by law.

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

28

1 61. DEFENDANT maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and
2 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS without regard to the correct
3 amount of overtime worked and correct applicable overtime rate for the amount of overtime
4 they worked. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT’S uniform policy and practice was to
5 unlawfully and intentionally deny timely payment of wages due for the overtime worked by
6 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and
7 DEFENDANT in fact failed to pay these employees the correct applicable overtime wages for
8 all overtime worked.

9 62. DEFENDANT’S uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices
10 manifested, without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a
11 whole, as a result of implementing a uniform policy and practice that denied accurate
12 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
13 CLASS for all overtime worked, including, the work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a
14 workday and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

15 63. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
16 inaccurately calculated the amount of overtime worked and the applicable overtime rates and
17 consequently underpaid the actual time worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the
18 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. DEFENDANT acted in an illegal attempt to avoid the
19 payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code, the
20 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and regulations.

21 64. As a direct result of DEFENDANT’S unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
22 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS did not
23 receive full compensation for all overtime worked.

24 65. Cal. Lab. Code § 515 sets out various categories of employees who are exempt
25 from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to
26 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. Further
27 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are not subject
28 to a valid collective bargaining agreement that would preclude the causes of action contained
herein this Complaint. Rather, PLAINTIFF brings this Action on behalf of herself and the

1 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS based on DEFENDANT'S violations of non-negotiable,
2 non-waivable rights provided by the State of California.

3 66. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the
4 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were paid less for time worked than
5 they were entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

6 67. DEFENDANT failed to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
7 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which was in
8 excess of the maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194 &
9 1198, even though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
10 CLASS were required to work, and did in fact work, overtime as to which DEFENDANT failed
11 to accurately record and pay using the applicable overtime rate as evidenced by
12 DEFENDANT'S business records and witnessed by employees.

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

19 69. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
20 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are under compensated for their overtime
21 worked. DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
22 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy,
23 practice and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to
24 pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS the
25 applicable overtime rate.

26 70. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor
27 laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for
28 all time worked and provide them with the requisite overtime compensation, DEFENDANT
acted and continue to act intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFF and
the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with a conscious and utter

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

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

15 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL PERIODS**

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

18 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
19 **Defendants)**

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

23 73. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to provide all
24 the legally required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR
25 SUB-CLASS Members as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. The nature
26 of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS MEMBERS
27 did not prevent these employees from being relieved of all of their duties for the legally required
28 off-duty meal periods. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other
CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were often not fully relieved of duty by

1 DEFENDANT for their meal periods. Additionally, DEFENDANT’S failure to provide
2 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members with legally required meal
3 breaks prior to their fifth (5th) hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANT’S business records.
4 As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
5 therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with
6 DEFENDANT’S strict corporate policy and practice.

7 74. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the
8 applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR
9 SUB-CLASS Members who were not provided a meal period, in accordance with the applicable
10 Wage Order, one additional hour of compensation at each employee’s regular rate of pay for
11 each workday that a meal period was not provided.

12 75. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and
13 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according to
14 proof at trial, and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.

15
16 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST PERIODS**

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

19 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
20 **Defendants)**

21 76. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
22 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
23 paragraphs of this Complaint.

24 77. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were
25 required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods.
26 Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some
27 shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten
28 (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

1 more. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were also not
2 provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules,
3 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were periodically
4 denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT’S managers.

5 78. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the
6 applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR
7 SUB-CLASS Members who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with the applicable
8 Wage Order, one additional hour of compensation at each employee’s regular rate of pay for
9 each workday that rest period was not provided.

10 79. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and
11 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according to
12 proof at trial, and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.

13
14 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS**
16 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

17 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and**
18 **against all Defendants)**

19 80. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
20 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
21 paragraphs of this Complaint.

22 81. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with
23 an “accurate itemized” statement in writing showing:

- 24 a. Gross wages earned;
- 25 b. Total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose
26 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
27 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the
28 Industrial Welfare Commission;

- 1 c. The number of piece rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the
- 2 employee is paid on a piece-rate basis;
- 3 d. All deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the
- 4 employee may be aggregated and shown as one item;
- 5 e. Net wages earned;
- 6 f. The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;
- 7 g. The name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by
- 8 January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or
- 9 an employee identification number other than a social security number may be
- 10 shown on the itemized statement;
- 11 h. The name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and
- 12 i. All applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
- 13 number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

14 82. When PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members worked overtime
15 in the same pay period they earned incentive wages and/or missed meal and rest breaks,
16 DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
17 CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things,
18 the correct overtime rate for overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8)
19 hours in a workday and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek, and the correct penalty payments
20 or missed meal and rest periods. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides that every employer shall
21 furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing
22 showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during
23 the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. Aside from the
24 violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an
25 itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226 *et seq.*
26 As a result, from time to time DEFENDANT provided PLAINTIFF and the other members of
27 the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

28

1 83. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Labor
2 Code § 226, causing injury and damages to the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
3 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs
4 expended calculating the correct rates for the overtime worked and the amount of employment
5 taxes which were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are
6 difficult to estimate. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
7 LABOR SUB-CLASS may elect to recover liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the
8 initial pay period in which the violation occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each
9 violation in a subsequent pay period pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according
10 to proof at the time of trial (but in no event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for
11 PLAINTIFF and each respective member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS herein).

12
13 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **FAILURE TO PAY WAGES WHEN DUE**

15 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§201, 202, 203)**

16 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
17 **Defendants)**

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

21 85. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

22 As used in this article:(a) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by
23 employees of every description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the
24 standard of time, task, piece, Commission basis, or other method of calculation.

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

26 86. Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides, in relevant part, that "If an employer discharges
27 an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable
28 immediately."

1 87. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

11 88. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF’S or any CALIFORNIA LABOR
12 SUB-CLASS Members’ employment contract.

13 89. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

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

19 90. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
20 CLASS Members terminated and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of overtime wages,
21 to these employees who actually worked overtime, as required by law.

22 91. Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of themselves and the
23 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS whose employment has, PLAINTIFF
24 demands up to thirty days of pay as penalty for not paying all wages due at time of termination
25 for all employees who terminated employment during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
26 PERIOD, and demands an accounting and payment of all wages due, plus interest and statutory
27 costs as allowed by law.

28 //

//

//

//

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§2698 et seq.)**

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

5 92. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth
6 herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

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

17 94. Plaintiff, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the
18 requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act,
19 bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to themselves
20 and all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT and classified as
21 non-exempt employees in California during the time period of December 19, 2017 until the
22 present (the "AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES").

23 95. On December 19, 2018, Plaintiff gave written notice by certified mail to the
24 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and the employer of the
25 specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code §
26 2699.3. See Exhibit #1, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference herein. The
27 statutory waiting period for Plaintiff to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As
28 a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, Plaintiff may now commence a representative civil action

1 under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all
2 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

3 1. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
4 business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to properly record and pay Plaintiff
5 and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all of the hours they worked, including overtime
6 hours in violation of the Wage Order, (b) failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements,
7 (c) failed to provide mandatory meal breaks and rest breaks, and (d) failed to timely pay wages,
8 all in violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §2699.5, including
9 but not limited to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1198,
10 and the applicable Industrial Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to statutory penalties as a
11 result of such conduct. Plaintiff hereby seeks recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the
12 Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representative of the State of
13 California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on Plaintiff and the other AGGRIEVED
14 EMPLOYEES.

15
16 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

17 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for a judgment against each Defendants, jointly and
18 severally, as follows:

19 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 20 a. That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA
21 CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- 22 b. An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining
23 DEFENDANT from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;
- 24 c. An order requiring DEFENDANT to pay all wages and all sums unlawfully
25 withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS; and
- 27 d. Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANT’S ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund
28 for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANT’S violations due to

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

PLAINTIFF and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

- 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS:
 - a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-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 due PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, during the applicable CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-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 member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-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; and
 - e. The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-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:
 - a. 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, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 218.5, § 226, §1194 and/or §1197.

DATED: February 25, 2019

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 25, 2019

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

EXHIBIT 1



ZAKAY LAW GROUP

A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

Client #18601

December 19, 2018

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

J.J.R. Enterprises, Inc.
c/o Daniel Reilly
10491 Old Placerville Road, Suite 150
Sacramento, CA 95827

Re: Notice of Violations of California Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1194, 1198, 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 Heather McIntyre (“Plaintiff”), and other aggrieved employees in a proposed lawsuit against J.J.R. Enterprises, Inc. (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from July 2018 to October 2018 as a nonexempt employee entitled to the legally required meal and rest breaks and payment for all time worked under Defendant’s control, including overtime worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for all of their time worked, including overtime wages, and for all of their missed meal and rest breaks. As a consequence of the aforementioned violations, Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to him, and other aggrieved employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1194, 1198, violates the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

A true and correct copy of the proposed Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendant, which (1) identifies the alleged violations, (2) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (3) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (4) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to Plaintiff, and (5) 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.

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 filing fee of \$75 is being mailed to the Department of Industrial Relations Accounting unit with an identification of the Plaintiff, the Defendant and the notice. 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 Statute 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,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Shani O. Zakay', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for Heather McIntyre

1 **ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APC**
2 Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
3 3990 Old Town Ave. Suite C204
4 San Diego, CA 92110
5 Telephone: (619) 255-9047
6 Website: www.zakaylaw.com

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff

8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
9 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

10 HEATHER MCINTYRE, an individual,
11 on behalf of herself and on behalf of all
12 persons similarly situated,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 J.J.R. ENTERPRISES, INC., a California
16 Corporation; and Does 1 through 50,
17 Inclusive,

18 Defendants.

Case No. _____

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

1. UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*;
2. FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 510, *et seq.*;
3. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
4. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226; and,
6. FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff Heather McIntyre (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of herself and all
2 other similarly situated current and former employees, alleges on information and belief,
3 except for her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the
4 following:
5

6 **THE PARTIES**
7

8 1. Defendant J.J.R. Enterprises, Inc. is a California corporation that at all relevant
9 times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business
0 throughout California.

1 2. DEFENDANT, doing business as Caltronics Business Systems, sells digital
2 copiers and printers, color copiers and printers, fax and multifunctional devices, scanning
3 devices, and document management and retrieval software. DEFENDANT provides
4 document management, scanning and capture, network fax systems, document workflow,
5 production print workflow and Web submission, and variable data printing solutions.
6 DEFENDANT also offers consultation and support service to federal, state, and local
7 governments, as well as provides managed print services. The company was founded in 1975
8 and is based in Sacramento, California.

9 3. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California as a non-exempt
10 employee entitled to overtime pay and meal and rest periods from Jul of 2018 to October of
11 2018. PLAINTIFF was at all times relevant mentioned herein classified by DEFENDANT
12 as a non-exempt employee paid in whole or in part on an hourly basis and received additional
13 compensation from DEFENDANT in the form of non-discretionary incentive wages. The
14 amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of
15 \$75,000.
16

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

8 5. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a CALIFORNIA
9 CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses incurred
0 during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANT’s uniform policy and
1 practice which failed to lawfully compensate these employees for all their overtime worked.
2 DEFENDANT’s uniform policy and practice alleged herein is an unlawful, unfair and
3 deceptive business practice whereby DEFENDANT retained and continues to retain wages
4 due PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF and the
5 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction enjoining such conduct by
6 DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically injured by DEFENDANT’s past and
8 current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable relief.

9 6. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
0 partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently
1 unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names
2 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this Complaint
3 to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are
4 ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and
5 belief alleges, that the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50,
6
7
8

1 inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that
2 proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

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

1

2

THE CONDUCT

3 8. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and
4 continues to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS for their overtime worked. DEFENDANT unlawfully and
6 unilaterally failed to accurately calculate wages for overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and
7 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees the
8 correct overtime compensation. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS forfeited wages due them for working overtime without compensation
0 at the correct overtime rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice to not pay the
1 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct overtime rate for all overtime worked in
2 accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

3 9. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half
4 times their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
5 were compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an
6

7

8

8

1 employee's performance.

2 10. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
3 Members' compensation was DEFENDANT's non-discretionary incentive program that paid
4 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
5 performance for DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all
6 employees paid on an hourly basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the
7 various performance goals set by DEFENDANT. However, when calculating the regular
8 rate of pay in order to pay overtime to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
9 Members, DEFENDANT failed to include the incentive compensation as part of the
0 employees' "regular rate of pay" for purposes of calculating overtime pay. Management and
1 supervisors described the incentive program to potential and new employees as part of the
2 compensation package. As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by
3 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members must be included in the "regular rate
4 of pay." The failure to do so has resulted in a systematic underpayment of overtime
5 compensation to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by DEFENDANT.

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

6

7

8

1 12. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also from time to time unable to take off duty meal
3 breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to perform work as ordered by
5 DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal
6 break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
7 Members with a second off-duty meal period from time to time in which these employees
8 were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. PLAINTIFF and the other
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional
0 compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

1 13. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours
3 without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied
4 their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to
5 four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked
6 of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten
7 (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more. PLAINTIFF and other
8 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof.
9 As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
0 Members were periodically denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and
1 DEFENDANT's managers.

2 14. When PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members worked
3 overtime in the same pay period they earned incentive wages and/or missed meal and rest
4 breaks, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show,
6 among other things, the correct overtime rate for overtime worked, including, work performed
7 in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek, and the
8 correct penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides
9 that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage
0 statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable

1 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at
2 each hourly rate. Aside, from the violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT
3 failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under
4 California Labor Code 226 *et seq.* As a result, from time to time DEFENDANT provided
5 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements
6 which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

7
8 15. By reason of this uniform conduct applicable to PLAINTIFF and all
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, DEFENDANT committed acts of unfair competition in
10 violation of the California Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*
11 (the “UCL”), by engaging in a company-wide policy and procedure which failed to accurately
12 calculate and record the correct overtime rate for the overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and
13 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. The proper calculation of these employees’
14 overtime hour rates is the DEFENDANT’s burden. As a result of DEFENDANT’s
15 intentional disregard of the obligation to meet this burden, DEFENDANT failed to properly
16 calculate and/or pay all required overtime compensation for work performed by the members
17 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and violated the California Labor Code and regulations
18 promulgated thereunder as herein alleged.

19 16. Specifically as to PLAINTIFF’s pay, DEFENDANT provided compensation to
20 her in the form of two components. One component of PLAINTIFF’s compensation was a
21 base hourly wage. The second component of PLAINTIFF’s compensation were non-
22 discretionary incentive wages. DEFENDANT paid the incentive wages, so long as
23 PLAINTIFF met certain predefined performance requirements. PLAINTIFF met
24 DEFENDANT’s predefined eligibility performance requirements in various pay periods
25 throughout her employment with DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT paid PLAINTIFF the
26 incentive wages. During these pay periods in which PLAINTIFF was paid the non-
27 discretionary incentive wages by DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF also worked overtime for
28 DEFENDANT, but DEFENDANT never included the incentive compensation in
29 PLAINTIFF’s regular rate of pay for the purposes of calculating what should have been

1 PLAINTIFF's accurate overtime rate and thereby underpaid PLAINTIFF for overtime
2 worked throughout her employment with DEFENDANT. The incentive compensation paid
3 by DEFENDANT constituted wages within the meaning of the California Labor Code and
4 thereby should have been part of PLAINTIFF's "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFF was also
5 from time to time unable to take off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of
6 duty for her meal periods. PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by
7 DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal
8 break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal
9 period from time to time in which he was required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours
0 of work. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks without additional
1 compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.
2 DEFENDANT also provided PLAINTIFF with a paystub that failed to accurately display
3 PLAINTIFF's correct rates of overtime pay and payments for missed meal and rest periods
4 for certain pay periods in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a). To date, DEFENDANT has
5 not fully paid PLAINTIFF the overtime compensation still owed to her or any penalty wages
6 owed to her under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF
7 individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

8 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

14 18. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
15 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANT (i) currently maintains and at all relevant
16 times maintained offices and facilities in this County and/or conducts substantial business in
17 this County, and (ii) committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against
18 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

1
2 **THE CALIFORNIA CLASS**

3 19. PLAINTIFF brings the First Cause of Action for Unfair, Unlawful and
4 Deceptive Business Practices pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the
5 "UCL") as a Class Action, pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, on behalf of a California
6 class, defined as all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in
7 California and classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any
8 time during the period beginning on the date four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint
9 and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD").
0 The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is
1 under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

2 20. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA
3 CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted
4 accordingly.

5 21. The California Legislature has commanded that "all wages... ..earned by any
6 person in any employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days
7 designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays", and further that "[a]ny work
8 in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one
9 workweek . . . shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the
0 regular rate of pay for an employee." (Lab. Code § 204 and § 510(a).) The Industrial Welfare
1 Commission (IWC), however, is statutorily authorized to "establish exemptions from the
2 requirement that an overtime rate of compensation be paid... ..for executive, administrative,
3 and professional employees, provided [inter alia] that the employee is primarily engaged in
4 duties that meet the test of the exemption, [and] customarily and regularly exercises discretion
5 and independent judgment in performing those duties..." (Lab. Code § 510(a).) Neither the
6
7
8

1 PLAINTIFF nor the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and/or the CALIFORNIA
2 LABOR SUB-CLASS qualify for exemption from the above requirements.

3 22. DEFENDANT, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in
4 violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order
5 requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and
6 wilfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT systematically failed to correctly
7 calculate and record overtime compensation for overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and the
8 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the
9 benefit of this work, required employees to perform this work and permitted or suffered to
0 permit this overtime work.

1 23. DEFENDANT has the legal burden to establish that each and every
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member is paid the applicable rate for all overtime worked and to
3 accurately calculate the “regular rate of pay” by including the incentive compensation that
4 PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were awarded by DEFENDANT.
5 DEFENDANT, however, as a matter of uniform and systematic policy and procedure failed
6 to have in place during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD and still fails to have in place a
7 policy or practice to ensure that each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member is paid the
8 applicable overtime rate for all overtime worked, so as to satisfy their burden. This common
9 business practice applicable to each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member can be
0 adjudicated on a class-wide basis as unlawful, unfair, and/or deceptive under Cal. Business
1 & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”) as causation, damages, and reliance are
2 not elements of this claim.

3 24. At no time during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD was the compensation for any
4 member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS properly recalculated so as to compensate the
5 employee for all overtime worked at the applicable rate, as required by California Labor Code
6

1 §§ 204 and 510, *et seq.* At no time during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD was the
2 overtime compensation for any member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS properly recalculated
3 so as to include all earnings in the overtime compensation calculation as required by
4 California Labor Code §§ 510, *et seq.*

5 25. The CALIFORNIA CLASS, is so numerous that joinder of all CALIFORNIA CLASS
6 Members is impracticable.

7 26. DEFENDANT uniformly violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA CLASS under
8 California law by:

9 (a) Violating the California Unfair Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§
0 17200, *et seq.*, by unlawfully, unfairly and/or deceptively having in place
1 company policies, practices and procedures that failed to pay all wages
2 due the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all overtime worked, and failed to
3 accurately record the applicable rates of all overtime worked by the
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS;

5 (b) Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the California Unfair
6 Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by
7 unlawfully, unfairly, and/or deceptively having in place a company
8 policy, practice and procedure that failed to correctly calculate overtime
9 compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the members of the
0 CALIFORNIA CLASS; and,

1 (c) Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the California Unfair
2 Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by failing
3 to provide mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

5 27. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a Class
6

1 Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

2 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that the
3 joinder of all such persons is impracticable and the disposition of their claims
4 as a class will benefit the parties and the Court;

5 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that
6 are raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS will
7 apply uniformly to every member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS;

8 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims of each
9 member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all the other
0 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, was subjected to the uniform
1 employment practices of DEFENDANT and was a non-exempt employee paid
2 on an hourly basis and paid additional non-discretionary incentive wages who
3 was subjected to the DEFENDANT's practice and policy which fails to pay the
4 correct rate of overtime wages due to the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all
5 overtime worked by the CALIFORNIA CLASS and thereby systematically
6 underpays overtime compensation to the CALIFORNIA CLASS.
7 PLAINTIFF sustained economic injury as a result of DEFENDANT's
8 employment practices. PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA
9 CLASS were and are similarly or identically harmed by the same unlawful,
0 deceptive, unfair and pervasive pattern of misconduct engaged in by
1 DEFENDANT; and,

2 (d) The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect
3 the interest of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and has retained counsel who are
4 competent and experienced in Class Action litigation. There are no material
5 conflicts between the claims of the representative PLAINTIFF and the members
6

1 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that would make class certification inappropriate.
2 Counsel for the CALIFORNIA CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of all
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

4 28. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action
5 properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in
6 that:

7 (a) Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive,
8 statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of
9 separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS will
0 create the risk of:

1 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members
2 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish incompatible
3 standards of conduct for the parties opposing the CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS; and/or,

5 2) Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA
6 CLASS which would as a practical matter be dispositive of interests of
7 the other members not party to the adjudication or substantially impair
8 or impede their ability to protect their interests.

9 (b) The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS have acted or refused to act
0 on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS, making
1 appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS
2 as a whole in that DEFENDANT uniformly failed to pay all wages due.
3 Including the correct overtime rate, for all worked by the members of the
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS as required by law;

5 1) With respect to the First Cause of Action, the final relief on behalf of the
6

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS sought does not relate exclusively to restitution
2 because through this claim PLAINTIFF seeks declaratory relief holding
3 that the DEFENDANT's policy and practices constitute unfair
4 competition, along with declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and
5 incidental equitable relief as may be necessary to prevent and remedy
6 the conduct declared to constitute unfair competition;

7 (c) Common questions of law and fact exist as to the members of the
8 CALIFORNIA CLASS, with respect to the practices and violations of
9 California law as listed above, and predominate over any question affecting
0 only individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, and a Class Action is
1 superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the
2 controversy, including consideration of:

3 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in
4 individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions in
5 that the substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to
6 recover the relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the
7 individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members when compared to the
8 substantial expense and burden of individual prosecution of this
9 litigation;

0 2) Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation
1 that would create the risk of:

2 A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
3 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, which would
4 establish incompatible standards of conduct for the
5 DEFENDANT; and/or,
6

- 1 asserting their rights individually out of fear of retaliation or adverse
2 impact on their employment;
- 3 (c) The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that it is
4 impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS before the
5 Court;
- 6 (d) PLAINTIFF, and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, will not be able
7 to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained
8 as a Class Action;
- 9 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable
0 relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and other
1 improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and
2 injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted upon the CALIFORNIA
3 CLASS;
- 4 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
5 DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- 7 (g) DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
8 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, thereby making final class-wide relief appropriate
9 with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole;
- 0 (h) The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are readily ascertainable from the
1 business records of DEFENDANT; and,
- 2 (i) Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring a
3 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour
4 related claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to the
5 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

1 30. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and identify by
2 job title each of DEFENDANT's employees who as have been systematically, intentionally
3 and uniformly subjected to DEFENDANT's company policy, practices and procedures as
4 herein alleged. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the Complaint to include any
5 additional job titles of similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

6

7

THE CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS

8 31. PLAINTIFF further brings the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth causes of Action
9 on behalf of a California sub-class, defined as all members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
0 classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS") at any
1 time during the period beginning on the date three (3) years prior to the filing of the complaint
2 and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
3 CLASS PERIOD") pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382. The amount in controversy for
4 the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is under five million
5 dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

6 32. DEFENDANT, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in violation
7 of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order
8 requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and
9 wilfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT failed to correctly calculate overtime
0 compensation for the overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
1 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit of
2 this work, required employees to perform this work and permitted or suffered to permit this
3 overtime work. DEFENDANT has uniformly denied these CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
4 CLASS Members overtime wages at the correct amount to which these employees are entitled
5 in order to unfairly cheat the competition and unlawfully profit. To the extent equitable
6 tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against

7

8

1 DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted
2 accordingly.

3 33. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and identify by
4 name and job title, each of DEFENDANT's employees who have been systematically,
5 intentionally and uniformly subjected to DEFENDANT's company policy, practices and
6 procedures as herein alleged. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the complaint to include
7 any additional job titles of similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

8 34. The CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all
9 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is impracticable.

0 35. Common questions of law and fact exist as to members of the CALIFORNIA
1 LABOR SUB-CLASS, including, but not limited, to the following:

2 (a) Whether DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to correctly calculate and pay
3 overtime compensation to members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
4 CLASS in violation of the California Labor Code and California regulations
5 and the applicable California Wage Order;

6 (b) Whether the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are entitled
7 to overtime compensation for overtime worked under the overtime pay
8 requirements of California law;

9 (c) Whether DEFENDANT failed to accurately record the applicable overtime
10 rates for all overtime worked PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
11 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;

12 (d) Whether DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members
13 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with legally required
14 uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal breaks and rest periods;

15 (e) Whether DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members
16 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with accurate itemized wage

- 1 statements;
- 2 (f) Whether DEFENDANT has engaged in unfair competition by the above-listed
- 3 conduct;
- 4 (g) The proper measure of damages and penalties owed to the members of the
- 5 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; and,
- 6 (h) Whether DEFENDANT's conduct was willful.

7 36. DEFENDANT, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, failed to

8 accurately calculate overtime compensation for the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS

9 Members and failed to provide accurate records of the applicable overtime rates for the

0 overtime worked by these employees. All of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS

1 Members, including PLAINTIFF, were non-exempt employees who were paid on an hourly

2 basis by DEFENDANT according to uniform and systematic company procedures as alleged

3 herein above. This business practice was uniformly applied to each and every member of

4 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and therefore, the propriety of this conduct can be

5 adjudicated on a class-wide basis.

6 37. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS under

7 California law by:

8 (a) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, *et seq.*, by failing to accurately pay

9 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-

10 CLASS the correct overtime pay for which DEFENDANT is liable

11 pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 1194 & § 1198;

12 (b) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF

13 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with all legally

14 required off-duty, uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal breaks and the

15 legally required rest breaks;

16 (c) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 226, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and the

1 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with an accurate
2 itemized statement in writing showing all accurate and applicable
3 overtime rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
4 amount of time worked at each overtime rate by the employee; and,

5 (d) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and/or 203, which provides that when an
6 employee is discharged or quits from employment, the employer must
7 pay the employee all wages due without abatement, by failing to tender
8 full payment and/or restitution of wages owed or in the manner required
9 by California law to the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
0 CLASS who have terminated their employment.

1 38. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a Class
2 Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

3 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so
4 numerous that the joinder of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
5 Members is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as a class will
6 benefit the parties and the Court;

7 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that
8 are raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
9 CLASS and will apply uniformly to every member of the CALIFORNIA
0 LABOR SUB-CLASS;

1 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims of each
2 member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all
3 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, was a non-
4 exempt employee paid on an hourly basis and paid additional non-discretionary
5 incentive wages who was subjected to the DEFENDANT's practice and policy
6 which failed to pay the correct rate of overtime wages due to the CALIFORNIA

1 LABOR SUB-CLASS for all overtime worked. PLAINTIFF sustained
2 economic injury as a result of DEFENDANT's employment practices.
3 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
4 were and are similarly or identically harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive,
5 unfair and pervasive pattern of misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANT; and,

6 (d) The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect
7 the interest of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and has retained
8 counsel who are competent and experienced in Class Action litigation. There
9 are no material conflicts between the claims of the representative PLAINTIFF
0 and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS that would make
1 class certification inappropriate. Counsel for the CALIFORNIA LABOR
2 SUB-CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA LABOR
3 SUB-CLASS Members.

4 39. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action is
5 properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

6 (a) Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive,
7 statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of
8 separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
9 CLASS will create the risk of:

10 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members
11 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would establish
12 incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the
13 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; or,

14 2) Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA
15 LABOR SUB-CLASS which would as a practical matter be dispositive
16 of interests of the other members not party to the adjudication or

1 substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests.

2 (b) The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have acted or
3 refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA
4 LABOR SUB-CLASS, making appropriate class-wide relief with
5 respect to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole in that
6 DEFENDANT uniformly failed to pay all wages due. Including the
7 correct overtime rate, for all overtime worked by the members of the
8 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as required by law;

9 (c) Common questions of law and fact predominate as to the members of the
0 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, with respect to the practices and
1 violations of California Law as listed above, and predominate over any question
2 affecting only individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, and
3 a Class Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient
4 adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

5 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
6 CLASS in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate
7 actions in that the substantial expense of individual actions will be
8 avoided to recover the relatively small amount of economic losses
9 sustained by the individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
0 Members when compared to the substantial expense and burden of
1 individual prosecution of this litigation;

2 2) Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation
3 that would create the risk of:

4 A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
5 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS,
6 which would establish incompatible standards of conduct

1 for the DEFENDANT; and/or,

2 B. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
3 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS would as a practical
4 matter be dispositive of the interests of the other members
5 not parties to the adjudication or substantially impair or
6 impede their ability to protect their interests;

7 3) In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of
8 individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid
9 asserting their legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANT,
0 which may adversely affect an individual's job with DEFENDANT or
1 with a subsequent employer, the Class Action is the only means to assert
2 their claims through a representative; and,

3 4) A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and
4 efficient adjudication of this litigation because class treatment
5 will obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative
6 litigation that is likely to result in the absence of certification of
7 this action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

8 40. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant to
9 Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

10 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
11 CLASS predominate over any question affecting only individual
12 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members;

13 (b) A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
14 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA
15 LABOR SUB-CLASS because in the context of employment litigation
16 a substantial number of individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-

1 CLASS Members will avoid asserting their rights individually out of fear
2 of retaliation or adverse impact on their employment;

3 (c) The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so numerous
4 that it is impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
5 CLASS before the Court;

6 (d) PLAINTIFF, and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members,
7 will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action
8 is maintained as a Class Action;

9 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable
0 relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and other
1 improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and
2 injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted upon the CALIFORNIA
3 LABOR SUB-CLASS;

4 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
5 DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for the injuries sustained;

7 (g) DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
8 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, thereby making final class-wide
9 relief appropriate with respect to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as
0 a whole;

1 (h) The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are readily
2 ascertainable from the business records of DEFENDANT. The
3 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS consists of all CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS Members classified as non-exempt employees during the
5 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD; and,

6 (i) Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring a

1 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour
2 related claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to the
3 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

4
5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **For Unlawful Business Practices**

7 **[Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*]**

(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS and Against All Defendants)

9 41. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and
0 corporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this
1 Complaint.

2 42. DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. and Prof. Code §
3 17021.

4 43. California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”) defines
5 unfair competition as any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice. Section
6 17203 authorizes injunctive, declaratory, and/or other equitable relief with respect to unfair
7 competition as follows:

8 Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition may be
9 enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court may make such orders or
0 judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to prevent the use
1 or employment by any person of any practice which constitutes unfair competition, as defined
2 in this chapter, or as may be necessary to restore to any person in interest any money or
3 property, real or personal, which may have been acquired by means of such unfair
4 competition.

5 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203.

6 44. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to engage in
7 a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the applicable
8 Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code including
9 Sections 204, 206.5, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194 and 1198, for which this Court should issue

1 declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be
2 necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to constitute unfair competition, including
3 restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

9 46. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were deceptive and
0 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice failed to pay PLAINTIFF, and
1 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, wages due for overtime worked, failed to
2 accurately to record the applicable rate of all overtime worked, and failed to provide the
3 required amount of overtime compensation due to a systematic miscalculation of the overtime
4 rate that cannot be justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare
5 Commission requirements in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this
6 Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203,
7 including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

8 47. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful, unfair
9 and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's employment practices caused PLAINTIFF and the
0 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with
1 DEFENDANT.

2 48. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unfair and
3 deceptive in that DEFENDANT's uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
4 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

5 49. Therefore, PLAINTIFF demands on behalf of herself and on behalf of each
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty

1 meal period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of
2 pay for each workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for
3 each ten (10) hours of work.

4 50. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of herself and on behalf of each CALIFORNIA
5 CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off duty paid rest period
6 was not timely provided as required by law.

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

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

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

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

1 55. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no plain,
2 speedy and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business practices
3 of DEFENDANT. Further, the practices herein alleged presently continue to occur
4 unabated. As a result of the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
5 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will
6 continue to suffer irreparable legal and economic harm unless DEFENDANT is restrained
7 from continuing to engage in these unlawful and unfair business practices.

8

9

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

0

For Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation

1

[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 510, 1194 and 1198]

2

(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All

3

Defendants)

4

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

7

57. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS bring
8 a claim for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code
9 and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to
10 accurately calculate the applicable rates for all overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other
11 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and DEFENDANT's failure to
12 properly compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for overtime
13 worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or forty
14 (40) hours in any workweek.

15

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

17

18

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

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

9 61. DEFENDANT maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the
0 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS without regard to the correct
1 amount of overtime worked and correct applicable overtime rate for the amount of overtime
2 they worked. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice was to
3 unlawfully and intentionally deny timely payment of wages due for the overtime worked by
4 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and
5 DEFENDANT in fact failed to pay these employees the correct applicable overtime wages
6 for all overtime worked.

7 62. DEFENDANT's uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
8 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a
9 result of implementing a uniform policy and practice that denied accurate compensation to
0 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for all
1 overtime worked, including, the work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday
2 and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

3 63. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
4 inaccurately calculated the amount of overtime worked and the applicable overtime rates and
5 consequently underpaid the actual time worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. DEFENDANT acted in an illegal attempt to avoid

1 the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code,
2 the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and regulations.

3 64. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
4 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS did not
5 receive full compensation for all overtime worked.

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

4 66. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other
5 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were paid less for time worked that
6 they were entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

7 67. DEFENDANT failed to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
8 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which was
9 in excess of the maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510,
10 1194 & 1198, even though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
11 SUB-CLASS were required to work, and did in fact work, overtime as to which
12 DEFENDANT failed to accurately record and pay using the applicable overtime rate as
13 evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records and witnessed by employees.

14 68. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
15 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
16 CLASS for the true time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the

1 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic
2 injury in amounts which are presently unknown to them and which will be ascertained
3 according to proof at trial.

4 69. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other members
5 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are under compensated for their overtime
6 worked. DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or
7 gross nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform company
8 policy, practice and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by
9 refusing to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
0 CLASS the applicable overtime rate.

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

9
10 71. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
11 therefore request recovery of all unpaid wages, including overtime wages, according to proof,
12 interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against
13 DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable
14 statutes. To the extent overtime compensation is determined to be owed to the
15 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members who have terminated their employment,
16 DEFENDANT'S conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these

1 individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which
2 penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
3 Members. DEFENDANT’s conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in
4 good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members
5 are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

6

7

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

8

For Failure to Provide Required Meal Periods

9

[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]

0

(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All

1

Defendants)

2

72. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS,
3 reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
4 paragraphs of this Complaint.

5

73. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, from time to time, DEFENDANT failed
6 to provide all the legally required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other
7 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members as required by the applicable Wage Order
8 and Labor Code. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA
9 LABOR SUB-CLASS MEMBERS did not prevent these employees from being relieved of
0 all of their duties for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result of their rigorous
1 work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were
2 often not fully relieved of duty by DEFENDANT for their meal periods. Additionally,
3 DEFENDANT’s failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
4 CLASS Members with legally required meal breaks prior to their fifth (5th) hour of work is
5 evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business records. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other
6 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS therefore forfeited meal breaks

7

8

1 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT’s strict corporate
2 policy and practice.

3 74. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable
4 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
5 CLASS Members who were not provided a meal period, in accordance with the applicable
6 Wage Order, one additional hour of compensation at each employee’s regular rate of pay for
7 each workday that a meal period was not provided.

8 75. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and
9 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according
0 to proof at trial, and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of
1 suit.

2
3 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **For Failure to Provide Required Rest Periods**

5 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]**

6 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All**
7 **Defendants)**

8 76. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS,
9 reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
0 paragraphs of this Complaint.

1 77. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were from
2 time to time required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10)
3 minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least
4 ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second
5 rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8)
6 hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts

1 worked of ten (10) hours or more. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
2 CLASS Members were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of
3 their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
4 Members were periodically denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and
5 DEFENDANT’s managers.

6 78. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable
7 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
8 CLASS Members who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with the applicable
9 Wage Order, one additional hour of compensation at each employee’s regular rate of pay for
0 each workday that rest period was not provided.

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

5
6
7
8
9
0

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

For Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Statements

[Cal. Lab. Code § 226]

**(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All
Defendants)**

1 80. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS,
2 reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
3 paragraphs of this Complaint.

4 81. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with an
5 “accurate itemized” statement in writing showing:

6 (1) gross wages earned,

- 1 (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation is
- 2 solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a)
- 3 of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission,
- 4 (3) the number of piecerate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid
- 5 on a piece-rate basis,
- 6 (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may
- 7 be aggregated and shown as one item,
- 8 (5) net wages earned,
- 9 (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
- 0 (7) the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1,
- 1 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee
- 2 identification number other than a social security number may be shown on the itemized
- 3 statement,
- 4 (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
- 5 (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number
- 6 of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

7 82. When PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members worked overtime in
8 the same pay period they earned incentive wages and/or missed meal and rest breaks,
9 DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show,
11 among other things, the correct overtime rate for overtime worked, including, work performed
12 in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek, and the
13 correct penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides
14 that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage
15 statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable
16 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at

1 each hourly rate. Aside, from the violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT
2 failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under
3 California Labor Code 226 *et seq.* As a result, from time to time DEFENDANT provided
4 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements
5 which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

6 83. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Labor Code §
7 226, causing injury and damages to the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
8 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs
9 expended calculating the correct rates for the overtime worked and the amount of employment
0 taxes which were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are
1 difficult to estimate. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
2 LABOR SUB-CLASS may elect to recover liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for
3 the initial pay period in which the violation occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for
4 each violation in a subsequent pay period pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount
5 according to proof at the time of trial (but in no event more than four thousand dollars
6 (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
7 SUB-CLASS herein).

8

9

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

10

For Failure to Pay Wages When Due

11

[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202, 203]

12

(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All

13

Defendants)

14

15

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

17

18

1 85. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:
2 As used in this article:(a) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of
3 every description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time, task,
4 piece, Commission basis, or other method of calculation.(b) "Labor" includes labor, work, or
5 service whether rendered or performed under contract, subcontract, partnership, station plan,
6 or other agreement if the labor to be paid for is performed personally by the person demanding
7 payment.

8
9 86. Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides, in relevant part, that “If an employer discharges an
10 employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable
11 immediately.”

12
13 87. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:
14 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment,
15 his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the
16 employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the
17 employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. Notwithstanding any other
18 provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a 72-hour notice shall be entitled
19 to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and designates a mailing address. The date
20 of the mailing shall constitute the date of payment for purposes of the requirement to provide
21 payment within 72 hours of the notice of quitting.

22
23 88. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF’s or any CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
24 CLASS Members’ employment contract.

25
26 89. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:
27 If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with
28 Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who
29 quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the
30 same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue
31 for more than 30 days.

32
33 90. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
34 Members terminated and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of overtime wages, to
35 these employees who actually worked overtime, as required by law.

36
37 91. Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of herself and the
38 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS whose employment has, PLAINTIFF
39 demands up to thirty days of pay as penalty for not paying all wages due at time of termination
40 for all employees who terminated employment during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
41 CLASS PERIOD, and demands an accounting and payment of all wages due, plus interest
42 and statutory costs as allowed by law.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

On behalf of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS:

- A) That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-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 due PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, during the applicable CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;
- C) Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;
- D) The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in

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

5 E) The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
6 CLASS as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until
7 an action therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.

8 On all claims:

9 A) An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;

0 B) Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and,

1 C) An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the law,

2

3 including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §218.5, §226, and/or §1194.

4

5 Dated: December , 2018

6

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APC

7

8

9

By: _____
Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for Plaintiff

0

1

2

3

4

5

6

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

7

8

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

2

3 Dated: December , 2018

4 ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APC

5

6

7

By: _____

Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for Plaintiff

8

9

0

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

8