

SHORT TITLE: Coffey v. Navy Federal Credit Union, et al.	CASE NUMBER:
---	--------------

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

- This form may be used as an attachment to any summons if space does not permit the listing of all parties on the summons.
- If this attachment is used, insert the following statement in the plaintiff or defendant box on the summons: "Additional Parties Attachment form is attached."

List additional parties (Check only one box. Use a separate page for each type of party.):

Plaintiff
 Defendant
 Cross-Complainant
 Cross-Defendant

NAVY FEDERAL FINANCIAL GROUP, LLC, a Virginia limited liability company; NAVY FEDERAL INVESTMENT SERVICES, LLC, a Virginia limited liability company; NAVY FEDERAL TITLE OF CALIFORNIA, INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
Julieann Alvarado (State Bar #334727)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 5400
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
shani@zakaylaw.com
jackland@zakaylaw.com
julieann@zakaylaw.com

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

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

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

MAUREEN COFFEY, an individual, on behalf
of herself, and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

NAVY FEDERAL CREDIT UNION, an
unknown business entity; NAVY FEDERAL
FINANCIAL GROUP, LLC, a Virginia limited
liability company; NAVY FEDERAL
INVESTMENT SERVICES, LLC, a Virginia
limited liability company; NAVY FEDERAL
TITLE OF CALIFORNIA, INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No: 37-2023-00034395-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 MAUREEN COFFEY (“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 NAVY FEDERAL CREDIT UNION (“Defendant Navy Federal Credit Union”) is an unknown business entity that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

2. Defendant NAVY FEDERAL FINANCIAL GROUP, LLC (“Defendant Navy Federal Financial Group”) is a Virginia limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

3. Defendant NAVY FEDERAL INVESTMENT SERVICES, LLC (“Defendant Navy Federal Investment Services”) is a Virginia limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

4. Defendant NAVY FEDERAL TITLE OF CALIFORNIA, INC. (“Defendant Navy Federal Title of California”) is a California corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

5. Defendant Navy Federal Credit Union, Defendant Navy Federal Financial Group, Defendant Navy Federal Investment Services and Defendant Navy Federal Title of California were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the documents issued to PLAINTIFF

1 and by the company PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively and are therefore jointly
2 responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein as “DEFENDANTS” and/or
3 “DEFENDANT.”

4 6. DEFENDANTS operate, own and manage credit unions and provide personal and
5 commercial financial services in the state of California, including in San Diego County where
6 PLAINTIFF worked.

7 7. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from May of 2021 to
8 April of 2023 as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis and entitled to the legally
9 required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time
10 worked.

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

19 9. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a CALIFORNIA
20 CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses incurred during
21 the CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANT’s uniform policy and practice which failed to
22 lawfully compensate these employees. DEFENDANT’s uniform policy and practice alleged
23 herein was an unlawful, unfair, and deceptive business practice whereby DEFENDANT retained
24 and continues to retain wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
25 CLASS. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction
26 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and the
27 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically injured by
28

1 DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable
2 relief.

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

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

20 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

25 13. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
26 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANT operates in locations across California, employs
27 the CALIFORNIA CLASS across California, including in this County, and committed the
28 wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

THE CONDUCT

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

21 **A. Meal Period Violations**

22 15. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
23 required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,
24 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including
25 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the CLASS
26 PERIOD, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work
27 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT’s control. Specifically,
28 DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be

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

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

24 **B. Rest Period Violations**

25 17. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without
27 being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and
28 DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons, these employees were denied

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

11 **C. Wage Statement Violations**

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

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

1 address of the legal entity of the employer, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226 (a)(8).
2 Additionally, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to issue wage statements to PLAINTIFF
3 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members that provided the accurate total number of hours
4 worked, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(2).

5 20. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide
6 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with
7 Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

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

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

16 23. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
17 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
18 work, including but not limited to, submitting to Covid-19 health screenings and off-the-clock
19 meetings. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to have
20 to work while off-the-clock.

21 24. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-
22 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

26 26. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
27 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to
28

1 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
2 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

3 27. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were non-
4 exempt employees, subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.

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

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

13 30. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
14 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT's direction, control, and
15 benefit for the time spent working while off-the-clock, including but not limited to, time spent
16 submitting to Covid-19 health screenings and off-the-clock work meetings. DEFENDANT's
17 uniform policy and practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA
18 CLASS wages for all hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by
19 DEFENDANT's business records.

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

22 31. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and
23 continues to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 Members for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and
25 redeemed sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
26 forfeited wages due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime
27 and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates.
28 DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at

1 the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and
2 redeemed sick pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business
3 records.

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

8 33. The second component of PLAINTIFF’s and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
9 Members’ compensation was DEFENDANTS’ non-discretionary incentive program that paid
10 PLAINTIFF and other CLASS MEMBERS incentive wages based on their performance for
11 DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly
12 basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by
13 DEFENDANTS.

14 34. However, from-time-to-time, when calculating the regular rate of pay, in those pay
15 periods where PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members worked overtime, double
16 time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-
17 discretionary bonus, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus
18 compensation as part of the employees’ “regular rate of pay” and/or calculated all hours worked
19 rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the
20 incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
21 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
22 CLASS members must be included in the “regular rate of pay.” The failure to do so has resulted
23 in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period
24 premiums, and redeemed sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members by
25 DEFENDANTS. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid sick time
26 for non-employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the
27 workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee
28 actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANTS’ conduct, as articulated herein, by

1 failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the “regular rate of pay” for purposes of
2 sick pay compensation was in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the underpayment of which is
3 recoverable under Cal. Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203 and/or 204.

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

15 **F. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

27 37. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell

1 phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to use their own cell phones in order to perform
3 work related tasks and purchase of work uniforms. However, DEFENDANT unlawfully failed
4 to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the personal expenses
5 incurred for the use of their personal cell phones and purchase of work uniforms. As a result, in
6 the course of their employment with DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
7 CLASS Members incurred unreimbursed business expenses that included, but were not limited
8 to, costs related to the use of their personal cell phones and purchase of work uniforms, all on
9 behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

10 **G. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

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

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

1 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

2 40. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, did not have an
3 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other members of
4 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the actual time PLAINTIFF and other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS worked each day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal
6 and rest breaks. Specifically, due to DEFENDANT’s error-prone timekeeping system,
7 approximately five to eight minutes of PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Member’s time
8 worked were taken each day. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact, unlawfully,
9 and unilaterally alter the time recorded in DEFENDANTS’ timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF
10 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees for
11 all hours worked, applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and
12 missed rest break.

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

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

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

1 **I. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages**

2 44. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, PLAINTIFF and the
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were entitled to timely payment of wages during their
4 employment. PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time, did not
5 receive payment of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages,
6 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages within permissible time period.

7 **J. Unlawful Deductions**

8 45. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF
9 and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' pay without explanations and without authorization to do
10 so or notice to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. As a result,
11 DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code § 221.

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

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

1
2 47. PLAINTIFF bring this Class Action on behalf of herself, and a California class
3 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Navy Federal Credit
4 Union and/or Defendant Navy Federal Financial Group and/or Defendant Navy Federal
5 Investment Services and/or Defendant Navy Federal Title of California in California and
6 classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period
7 beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined
8 by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”).

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

15 49. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
16 impractical.

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

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

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

23 51. PLAINTIFF are members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as
24 a result of DEFENDANT’s conduct and actions alleged herein.

25 52. PLAINTIFF’S claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and
26 PLAINTIFF have the same interests as the other members of the class.

27 53. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

1 54. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action
2 litigation.

3 55. Further, PLAINTIFF'S interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the
4 interest of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

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

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

20 a. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish incompatible standards of conduct
22 for the parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and/or,

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

27
28

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

6 65. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’s practices were deceptive and
7 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT’s uniform policy and practice failed to provide the legally
8 mandated meal and rest periods and the required amount of compensation for missed meal and
9 rest periods, and failed to pay minimum and overtime wages owed, due to a systematic business
10 practice that cannot be justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare
11 Commission requirements in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this
12 Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203,
13 including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

18 67. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’s practices were also unfair and
19 deceptive in that DEFENDANT’s uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
20 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members as
21 required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

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

27
28

1 69. 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 was
3 not timely provided as required by law.

4 70. 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 time worked, and
7 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 71. 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 Labor
12 Code, were unlawful and in violation of public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive, and
13 unscrupulous, were deceptive, and thereby constitute unlawful, unfair, and deceptive business
14 practices in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

15 72. 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 unfair
19 business practices, including earned but unpaid wages for all time worked.

20 73. 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 74. 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 of
26 DEFENDANT. Further, the practices herein alleged presently continue to occur unabated. As a
27 result of the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein, PLAINTIFF and the other
28 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable legal

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

3 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

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

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

10 76. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
11 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
12 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to accurately calculate and pay
13 minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

16 78. Cal. Lab. Code § 1197 provides the minimum wage for employees fixed by the
17 commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than
18 the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

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

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

26 81. DEFENDANT's uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
27 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of
28

1 implementing a uniform policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF
2 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in regard to minimum wage pay.

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

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

12 84. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked that they were entitled to, constituting a
14 failure to pay all earned wages.

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

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

27 87. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor
28 laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked

1 and provide them with the requisite compensation, DEFENDANT acted and continues to act
2 intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS with a conscious and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the
4 consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal
5 rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of
6 these employees.

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

18 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

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

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

25 90. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
26 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
27 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees for all
28

1 overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or
2 twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

3 91. 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 92. Cal. Lab. Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed
6 more than eight (8) hours per workday and/or more than forty (40) hours per workweek unless
7 they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

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

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

15 95. 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 failed to accurately record overtime worked by
18 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members and denied accurate compensation to
19 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked,
20 including, the overtime work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve
21 (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

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

28

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24
25
26
27
28 ///

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

5 105. 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.

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

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

27
28 ///

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

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

6 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

8 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

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

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

13 114. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

14 As used in this article:

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

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

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

22 116. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

23 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
24 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
25 thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention
26 to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.
27 Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a
28 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.

1 117. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF’S or any CALIFORNIA CLASS
2 Members’ employment contract.

3 118. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

4 If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with
5 Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who
6 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.

7 119. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
8 terminated, and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of wages to these employees who
9 missed meal and rest breaks, as required by law.

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

15 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

17 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

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

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

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

25 a. Gross wages earned,

26 b. (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose
27 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
28

1 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the
2 Industrial Welfare Commission,

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

16 123. When DEFENDANT did not accurately record PLAINTIFF'S and other
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurate missed
18 meal and rest break premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT violated Cal.
19 Lab. Code § 226 in that DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
20 CLASS Members with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other
21 things, all deductions, the accurate gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked
22 and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of
23 time worked at each hourly rate, and correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal
24 and rest periods. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to issue wage statements to
25 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members that provided the accurate name and
26 address of the legal entity of the employer, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226 (a)(8).
27 Additionally, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to issue wage statements to PLAINTIFF
28 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members that provided the accurate total number of hours

1 worked, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(2).

2 124. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT failed to provide itemized wage
3 statements to PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that complied with the
4 requirements of California Labor Code Section 226.

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

16 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

18 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

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

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

23 127. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

24 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or
25 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
26 duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though
27 unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them
28 to be unlawful.

27 128. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab.
28 Code § 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS

1 members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANT's
2 benefit. DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
3 members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, the use of their personal cell
4 phones and purchase of work uniforms, all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.
5 Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by
6 DEFENDANT to use their personal cell phones and purchase their own uniforms to execute their
7 essential job duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. DEFENDANT's uniform policy, practice and
8 procedure was to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for
9 expenses resulting from the use of their personal cell phones and purchase of work uniforms for
10 DEFENDANT within the course and scope of their employment for DEFENDANT. These
11 expenses were necessary to complete their principal job duties. DEFENDANT is estopped by
12 DEFENDANT's conduct to assert any waiver of this expectation. Although these expenses were
13 necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members,
14 DEFENDANT failed to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
15 members for these expenses as an employer is required to do under the laws and regulations of
16 California.

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

21 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

24 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 25 a. That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA
26 CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
27 b. An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining
28 DEFENDANT from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;

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. An order requiring DEFENDANT to pay all overtime wages and all sums unlawfully withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and
 - d. Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANT’s ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANT’s violations due to PLAINTIFF and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.
2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:
- a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
 - b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory damages for overtime compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;
 - c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;
 - d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226
 - e. The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
 - 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.

///


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

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: August 11, 2023

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC


By: 
Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: August 11, 2023

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: 
Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for PLAINTIFF