

**SUMMONS  
(CITACION JUDICIAL)**

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

51ST ST. & 8TH AVE. CORP., a New York corporation; LOWES CORONADO HOTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation; LOEW'S HOTELS, INC., a New York corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

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

ROSA SOLIS, an individual, on behalf of herself, and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**  
Superior Court of California,  
County of San Diego  
**05/19/2023** at 03:28:27 PM  
Clerk of the Superior Court  
By Tanisha Moore, Deputy Clerk

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

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site ([www.lawhelpcalifornia.org](http://www.lawhelpcalifornia.org)), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center ([www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp)), or by contacting your local court or county bar association.

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

*Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, ([www.lawhelpcalifornia.org](http://www.lawhelpcalifornia.org)), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, ([www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol/](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol/)) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales.*

The name and address of the court is:  
(El nombre y dirección de la corte es):  
San Diego Superior Court - Hall of Justice Courthouse  
330 West Broadway  
San Diego, CA 92101

CASE NUMBER: 37-2023-00021359-CU-0E-CTL  
(Número del Caso).

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:  
(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):  
Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq. SBN:248676 Tel: (619) 599-8292 Fax: (858) 599-8291  
JCL Law Firm, APC - 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600, San Diego, CA 92121

DATE: 05/22/2023  
(Fecha)

Clerk, by \_\_\_\_\_  
(Secretario)

  
T. Moore

\_\_\_\_\_, Deputy  
(Adjunto)

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

**NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED:** You are served

1.  as an individual defendant.
2.  as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
3.  on behalf of (specify):  
under:  CCP 416.10 (corporation)  CCP 416.60 (minor)  
 CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation)  CCP 416.70 (conservatee)  
 CCP 416.40 (association or partnership)  CCP 416.90 (authorized person)  
 other (specify):
4.  by personal delivery on (date):



**JCL LAW FIRM, APC**

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

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**  
Superior Court of California,  
County of San Diego  
**05/19/2023** at 03:28:27 PM  
Clerk of the Superior Court  
By Tanisha Moore, Deputy Clerk

**ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)  
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 5400  
San Diego, CA 92121  
Telephone: (619) 255-9047  
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203  
[shani@zakaylaw.com](mailto:shani@zakaylaw.com)

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

ROSA SOLIS, an individual, on behalf of herself, and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

51ST ST. & 8TH AVE. CORP., a New York corporation; LOWES CORONADO HOTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation; LOEW'S HOTELS, INC., a New York corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No: 37-2023-00021359-CU-OE-CTL

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

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

**DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff ROSA SOLIS (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated current and former employees, allege on information and belief, except for her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

**PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

1. Defendant 51ST ST. & 8TH AVE. CORP. is a New York corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

2. Defendant LOWES CORONADO HOTEL CORPORATION is a Delaware corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

3. Defendant LOEW’S HOTELS, INC. is a New York corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

4. Defendant 51ST ST. & 8TH AVE. CORP., Defendant LOWES CORONADO HOTEL CORPORATION and Defendant LOEW’S HOTELS, INC. were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the documents issued to PLAINTIFF and by the company PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively and are therefore jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein as “DEFENDANTS” and/or “DEFENDANT.”

5. DEFENDANTS operate, own and manage hotels in the state of California, including in San Diego County where PLAINTIFF worked.

///

1           6.     PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from May of 2012 to  
2 June of 2022 as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis and entitled to the legally  
3 required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time  
4 worked.

5           7.     PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a California class,  
6 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant 51ST ST. & 8TH AVE.  
7 CORP. and/or Defendant LOWES CORONADO HOTEL CORPORATION and/or Defendant  
8 LOEW'S HOTELS, INC. who performed work for Defendant 51ST ST. & 8TH AVE. CORP.  
9 and/or Defendant LOWES CORONADO HOTEL CORPORATION and classified as non-  
10 exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning four  
11 (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court  
12 (the "CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of the  
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

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

25           9.     The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,  
26 partnership, associate or otherwise of DEFENDANTS DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are  
27 presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these DEFENDANTS by such fictitious  
28 names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this

1 Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are  
2 ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief  
3 alleges, that the DEFENDANTS named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50,  
4 inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that  
5 proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

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

#### 14 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

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

#### 23 **THE CONDUCT**

24 13. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the  
25 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a  
26 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically  
27 failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate  
28 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for missed meal and rest

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

15 **A. Meal Period Violations**

16 14. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was  
17 required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,  
18 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including  
19 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the CLASS  
20 PERIOD, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work  
21 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. Specifically,  
22 DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be  
23 PLAINTIFF'S off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not  
24 even receive a partial lunch. As a result, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
25 Members forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their  
26 time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and  
27 overtime rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other  
28

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business  
2 records.

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

20 **B. Rest Period Violations**

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

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

7 **C. Wage Statement Violations**

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

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

24 19. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide  
25 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with  
26 Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

27 20. As a result, DEFENDANT issued PLAINTIFF and other members of the  
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements that violate Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further,



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

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

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

7 22. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required  
8 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift  
9 work, including but not limited to, submitting to Covid-19 health screenings and off-the-clock  
10 loss prevention inspections. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other members of the  
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS to have to work while off-the-clock.

12 23. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-  
13 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

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

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

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

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

3           29.    As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
4 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT’s direction, control, and  
5 benefit for the time spent working while off-the-clock, including but not limited to, time spent  
6 submitting to Covid-19 health screenings and off-the-clock loss prevention inspections.  
7 DEFENDANT’s uniform policy and practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the  
8 CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all hours worked in accordance with applicable law is  
9 evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business records.

10       **E. Regular Rate Violation – Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums,**  
11       **and Redeemed Sick Pay**

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

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

26           32.    The second component of PLAINTIFF’s and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
27 Members’ compensation was DEFENDANTS’ non-discretionary incentive program that paid  
28 PLAINTIFF and other CLASS MEMBERS incentive wages based on their performance for

1 DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly  
2 basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by  
3 DEFENDANTS.

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

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

1 pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain an  
2 unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable tolling  
3 operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS members against DEFENDANT, the  
4 CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

5 **F. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

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

28 ///

1       **G. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

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

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

20       **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

21           39. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, did not have an  
22 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other members of  
23 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the actual time PLAINTIFF and other members of the  
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS worked each day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal  
25 and rest breaks. Specifically, due to DEFENDANT's error-prone timekeeping system,  
26 approximately five to eight minutes of PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Member's time  
27 worked were taken each day. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact, unlawfully,  
28 and unilaterally alter the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF

1 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees for  
2 all hours worked, applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and  
3 missed rest break.

4 40. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, from  
5 time-to-time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and  
6 without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

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

14 42. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
15 forfeited wages due them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS' direction, control and benefit  
16 for the time the timekeeping system was inoperable. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and  
17 practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all  
18 hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business  
19 records.

#### 20 **I. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages**

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

#### 26 **J. Unlawful Deductions**

27 44. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF  
28 and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' pay without explanations and without authorization to do

1 so or notice to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. As a result,  
2 DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code § 221.

3 45. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take  
4 off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for her rest and meal periods.  
5 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5)  
6 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to  
7 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which she was required  
8 by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANT provided PLAINTIFF  
9 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on premises, on-duty and on-call for the  
10 rest break. DEFENDANT policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on premises, on-call and on-duty  
11 during what was supposed to be her off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal  
12 and rest breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT’S strict  
13 corporate policy and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANT also provided PLAINTIFF with paystubs  
14 that failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANT failed to reimburse  
15 PLAINTIFF for required business expenses related to the use of her personal cell phone and for  
16 the purchase of her work uniform in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 2802. To date, DEFENDANT  
17 has not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed  
18 to her or any penalty wages owed to her under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy  
19 for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

20 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

21 46. PLAINTIFF bring this Class Action on behalf of herself, and a California class  
22 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant 51ST ST. & 8TH AVE.  
23 CORP. and/or Defendant LOWES CORONADO HOTEL CORPORATION and/or Defendant  
24 LOEW’S HOTELS, INC. who performed work for Defendant 51ST ST. & 8TH AVE. CORP.  
25 and/or Defendant LOWES CORONADO HOTEL CORPORATION in California and classified  
26 as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period beginning  
27 four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the  
28 Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”).

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

7           48. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is  
8 impractical.

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

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

28 ///



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

15 50. PLAINTIFF are members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as  
16 a result of DEFENDANT's conduct and actions alleged herein.

17 51. PLAINTIFF'S claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and  
18 PLAINTIFF have the same interests as the other members of the class.

19 52. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the  
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

21 53. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action  
22 litigation.

23 54. Further, PLAINTIFF'S interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the  
24 interest of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

25 55. There is a strong community of interest among PLAINTIFF and the members of  
26 the CALIFORNIA CLASS to, inter alia, ensure that the combined assets of DEFENDANT are  
27 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries  
28 sustained.



1           60.     DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. And Prof.  
2 Code § 17021.

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

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

14           62.     By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to  
15 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the  
16 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code  
17 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,  
18 1198, and 2802 for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant  
19 to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held  
20 to constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

26           64.     By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’s practices were deceptive and  
27 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT’s uniform policy and practice failed to provide the legally  
28 mandated meal and rest periods and the required amount of compensation for missed meal and  
rest periods, and failed to pay minimum and overtime wages owed, due to a systematic business  
practice that cannot be justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare  
Commission requirements in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this

1 Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203,  
2 including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

3 65. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful,  
4 unfair, and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's employment practices caused PLAINTIFF and the  
5 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with  
6 DEFENDANT.

7 66. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unfair and  
8 deceptive in that DEFENDANT's uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide  
9 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members as  
10 required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

11 67. Therefore, PLAINTIFF demands on behalf of herself and on behalf of each  
12 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty meal  
13 period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of pay for  
14 each workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for each ten (10)  
15 hours of work.

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

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

25 70. All the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the Industrial  
26 Welfare Commission Wage Orders, the California Code of Regulations, and the California Labor  
27 Code, were unlawful and in violation of public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive, and  
28

1 unscrupulous, were deceptive, and thereby constitute unlawful, unfair, and deceptive business  
2 practices in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

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

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

12 73. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no plain,  
13 speedy and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business practices of  
14 DEFENDANT. Further, the practices herein alleged presently continue to occur unabated. As a  
15 result of the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein, PLAINTIFF and the other  
16 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable legal  
17 and economic harm unless DEFENDANT is restrained from continuing to engage in these  
18 unlawful and unfair business practices.

19 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

22 **Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against ALL Defendants)**

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

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

1 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to accurately calculate and pay  
2 minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

5 77. Cal. Lab. Code § 1197 provides the minimum wage for employees fixed by the  
6 commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than  
7 the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

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

10 79. DEFENDANT maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the  
11 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time they  
12 work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and  
13 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

15 80. DEFENDANT's uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,  
16 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of  
17 implementing a uniform policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF  
18 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in regard to minimum wage pay.

19 81. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT  
20 inaccurately calculated the correct time worked and consequently underpaid the actual time  
21 worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. DEFENDANT acted  
22 in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of  
23 the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable  
24 laws and regulations.

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

28 ///

1           83. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked that they were entitled to, constituting a  
3 failure to pay all earned wages.

4           84. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned  
5 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the true  
6 time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have  
7 suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are presently unknown  
8 to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

9           85. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other  
10 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under-compensated for their time worked.  
11 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross  
12 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice  
13 and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay  
14 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct minimum wages  
15 for their time worked.

16           86. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor  
17 laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked  
18 and provide them with the requisite compensation, DEFENDANT acted and continues to act  
19 intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS with a conscious and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the  
21 consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal  
22 rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of  
23 these employees.

24           87. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore request  
25 recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the  
26 assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the  
27 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent minimum wage  
28 compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have

1 terminated their employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or  
2 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab.  
3 Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA CLASS  
4 Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good  
5 faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are entitled to seek and  
6 recover statutory costs.

7 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

10 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against ALL Defendants)**

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

14 89. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for  
15 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial  
16 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees for all  
17 overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or  
18 twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

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

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

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

28 ///



1           93. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members  
2 were required by DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time  
3 they worked, including overtime work.

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

11           95. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT  
12 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by  
13 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANT acted in an illegal  
14 attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California  
15 Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and  
16 regulations.

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

20           97. Cal. Lab. Code § 515 sets out various categories of employees who are exempt  
21 from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to  
22 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Further, PLAINTIFF and the  
23 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are not subject to a valid collective bargaining  
24 agreement that would preclude the causes of action contained herein this Complaint. Rather,  
25 PLAINTIFF bring this Action on behalf of herself, and the CALIFORNIA CLASS, based on  
26 DEFENDANT's violations of non-negotiable, non-waivable rights provided by the State of  
27 California.

28 ///

1           98. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for overtime worked that they were entitled to, constituting  
3 a failure to pay all earned wages.

4           99. DEFENDANT failed to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which was in excess of the  
6 maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, & 1198, even  
7 though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were regularly required  
8 to work, and did in fact work overtime, and did in fact work overtime as to which DEFENDANT  
9 failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records and  
10 witnessed by employees.

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

16           101. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other  
17 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were undercompensated for their time worked.  
18 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross  
19 nonfeasance, to not pay them for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice and  
20 procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF  
21 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct overtime wages for their  
22 overtime worked.

23           102. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor  
24 laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked  
25 and provide them with the requisite compensation, DEFENDANT acted and continues to act  
26 intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS with a conscious of and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the  
28 consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal

1 rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of  
2 these employees.

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

#### 13 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### 14 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

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

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

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

20 105. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to provide all the legally  
21 required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members as  
22 required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. The nature of the work performed by  
23 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members did not prevent these employees from being  
24 relieved of all of their duties for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result of their  
25 rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were often not  
26 fully relieved of duty by DEFENDANT for their meal periods. Additionally, DEFENDANT's  
27 failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with legally required  
28 meal breaks prior to their fifth (5<sup>th</sup>) hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business

1 records. Further, DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS  
2 Members with a second off-duty meal period in some workdays in which these employees were  
3 required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other  
4 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation  
5 and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

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

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

14 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

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

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

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

21 109. From time to time, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were  
22 required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods.  
23 Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some  
24 shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10)  
25 minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and  
26 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more.  
27 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one-hour  
28 wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were periodically denied their proper rest periods by  
2 DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers. In addition, DEFENDANT failed to compensate  
3 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for their rest periods as required by the  
4 applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. As a result, DEFENDANT's failure to provide  
5 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with all the legally required paid rest  
6 periods is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

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

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

15 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

17 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

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

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

22 113. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

23 As used in this article:

- 24 (d) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of every  
25 description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time,  
26 task, piece, Commission basis, or other method of calculation.  
27 (e) "Labor" includes labor, work, or service whether rendered or performed under  
28 contract, subcontract, partnership, station plan, or other agreement if the to be  
paid for is performed personally by the person demanding payment.

1           114. Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides, in relevant part, that “If an employer discharges  
2 an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable  
3 immediately.”

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

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

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

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

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

24  
25  
26  
27  
28 ///



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

10           123. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT failed to provide itemized wage  
11 statements to PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that complied with the  
12 requirements of California Labor Code Section 226.

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

24  
25  
26  
27  
28 ///



1 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

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

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

8 126. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

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

1 members for these expenses as an employer is required to do under the laws and regulations of  
2 California.

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

7 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

10 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

21 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

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


- c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;
- d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226
- e. The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
- f. The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS incurred in the course of their job duties, plus interest, and costs of suit.

3. On all claims:

- a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
- b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and
- c. An award of penalties, attorneys’ fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 218.5, § 226, and/or § 1194.

DATED: May 19, 2023

**JCL LAW FIRM, APC**

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_

Jean-Claude Lapuyade

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: May 19, 2023

**JCL LAW FIRM, APC**

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jean-Claude Lapuyade

Attorney for PLAINTIFF