

**SUMMONS
(CITACION JUDICIAL)**

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

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

12/5/2024 3:15:26 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By B. Ramirez ,Deputy Clerk

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

BRUJAS, LLC, a California limited liability company; TAHONA MERCADO LLC, a California limited liability company; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

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

VERONICA WATSON, an individual, on behalf of herself, and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,

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

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

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

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

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

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

CASE NUMBER:
(Número del Caso):

24CU026643C

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

DATE: 12/6/2024
(Fecha)

Clerk, by  , Deputy
(Secretario) (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)).

B. Ramirez

[SEAL]



NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

- as an individual defendant.
- as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
- 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):
- by personal delivery on (date):

1 **JCL LAW FIRM, APC**

2 Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
3 Perssia Razma (State Bar #351398)
4 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
5 San Diego, CA 92121
6 Telephone: (619) 599-8292
7 jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
8 prazma@jcl-lawfirm.com

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

12/5/2024 3:15:26 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By B. Ramirez ,Deputy Clerk

6 **ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

7 Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
8 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
9 San Diego, CA 92121
10 Telephone: (619)255-9047
11 shani@zakaylaw.com

12 Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

13 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

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

15 VERONICA WATSON, an individual, on
16 behalf of herself, and on behalf of all persons
17 similarly situated,

18 Plaintiff,

19 v.

20 BRUJAS, LLC, a California limited liability
21 company; TAHONA MERCADO LLC, a
22 California limited liability company; and DOES
23 1-50, Inclusive,

24 Defendants.

Case No: 24CU026643C

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

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

- 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
- 8) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
- 9) FAILURE TO PROVIDE GRATUITIES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 351;
- 10) FAILURE TO PERMIT INSPECTION OF EMPLOYEE RECORDS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §1198.5.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS

1. Defendant BRUJAS, LLC, (“DEFENDANT BRUJAS”) is a California limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

2. Defendant TAHONA MERCADO LLC, (“DEFENDANT TAHONA”), is a California limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

3. DEFENDANT BRUJAS, DEFENDANT TAHONA, and DOES 1 through 50 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.”

4. DEFENDANTS own and operate bars and restaurants throughout California, including in the county of San Diego, where PLAINTIFF worked.

5. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in California from September of 2023 to February of 2024, as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the

1 legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all
2 time worked.

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

9 7. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a CALIFORNIA
10 CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses incurred during
11 the CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANTS’ uniform policy and practice which failed to
12 lawfully compensate these employees. DEFENDANTS’ uniform policy and practice alleged
13 herein were unlawful, unfair, and deceptive business practices whereby DEFENDANTS retained
14 and continue to retain wages due PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
15 CLASS. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction
16 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANTS in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and
17 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically injured by
18 DEFENDANTS’ past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable
19 relief.

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

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

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

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

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

23 13. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction
24 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANTS in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and
25 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who has been economically injured by
26 DEFENDANTS' past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable
27 relief.

28 ///

1 advantage over competitors who comply with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to
2 toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS, the CLASS PERIOD should
3 be adjusted accordingly.

4 **A. Meal Period Violations**

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

19 18. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work
20 schedules and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty
22 meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for
24 more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further,
25 DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a
26 second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees are required by
27 DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by
28 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members does not qualify for the limited and

1 narrowly construed “on-duty” meal period exception. When they were provided with meal
2 periods, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time,
3 required to remain on duty and on call. DEFENDANTS’ failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with legally required meal breaks is evidenced by
5 DEFENDANTS’ business records. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and
6 DEFENDANTS’ inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA
7 CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with
8 DEFENDANTS’ strict corporate policy and practice.

9 **B. Rest Period Violations**

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

24 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

25 20. DEFENDANTS as a matter of corporate policy, practice, and procedure,
26 intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to reimburse and indemnify the PLAINTIFF
27 and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for required business expenses incurred by the
28 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members in direct consequence of discharging

1 their duties on behalf of DEFENDANTS. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers
2 are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their
3 employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or
4 her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
5 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of
6 the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions,
7 believed them to be unlawful."

8 21. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and
9 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal
10 cell phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and
11 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to use their personal cell phones in order
12 to perform work related tasks. However, DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to reimburse
13 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the use of their personal cell phones.
14 As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANTS, the PLAINTIFF and other
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred unreimbursed business expenses that included, but
16 were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cell phones, all on behalf of and for
17 the benefit of DEFENDANTS.

18 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

27 23. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for

1 missed meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANTS
2 also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and
3 accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the total hours
4 worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
5 amount of time worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed
6 meal and rest periods.

7 24. Further, from time to time, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately list the name and
8 address of the legal entity that is the employer for purposes of Cal. Lab. Code §226(a)(8).
9 DEFENDANTS' failure to accurately list the name and address of the legal entity that is the
10 employer violates Cal. Lab. Code §226(a)(8).

11 25. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANTS, from time to time, failed to provide
12 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with
13 Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(1)-(9).

14 26. As a result, DEFENDANTS issued PLAINTIFF and other members of the
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements that violate Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further,
16 DEFENDANTS' violations are knowing and intentional, were not isolated due to an unintentional
17 payroll error due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

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

19 27. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS failed and
20 continue to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
21 for all hours worked.

22 28. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS required
23 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
24 work, including but not limited to, opening and closing keyholder duties. This resulted in
25 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS having to work while off-the-
26 clock.

27 29. DEFENDANTS directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-
28 the-clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

1 30. DEFENDANTS controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
2 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

4 31. DEFENDANTS were able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
5 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANTS failed to
6 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
7 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

8 32. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were non-
9 exempt employees, subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.

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

16 34. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
17 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

18 35. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
19 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS' direction, control, and
20 benefit for the time spent working while off-the-clock, including but not limited to, opening and
21 closing keyholder duties. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice to not pay PLAINTIFF
22 and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all hours worked in accordance with
23 applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

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

26 36. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed and
27 continue to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS
28 Members for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and

1 redeemed sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
2 forfeited wages due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime
3 and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates.
4 DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice not to pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at
5 the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick
6 pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

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

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

17 39. However, from time to time, when calculating the regular rate of pay in those pay
18 periods where PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members worked overtime, double
19 time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-
20 discretionary bonuses, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus
21 compensation as part of the employee's "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked
22 rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the
23 incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
24 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
25 CLASS Members must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted
26 in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period
27 premium payments, and redeemed sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
28 Members by DEFENDANTS. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that

1 paid sick time for non-exempt employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular
2 rate of pay for the workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or
3 not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANTS’ conduct, as
4 articulated herein, by failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the “regular rate of
5 pay” for purposes of sick pay compensation was in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the
6 underpayment of which is recoverable under Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201, 202, 203, and/or 204.

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

16 **G. Unlawful Deductions**

17 41. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF
18 and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’ pay without explanations and without authorization to do
19 so or notice to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. As a result,
20 DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code § 221.

21 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

22 42. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, did not have an
23 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other members of
24 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the actual time PLAINTIFF and other members of the
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS worked each day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal
26 and rest breaks. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and
27 unilaterally alter the time recorded in DEFENDANTS’ timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and
28 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees for all

1 hours worked, applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and
2 missed rest breaks.

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

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

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

19 **I. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

20 46. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS did not have in
21 place an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the actual time these employees worked each day,
23 including overtime hours. Specifically, DEFENDANT had in place an unlawful rounding policy
24 and practice that resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members being
25 undercompensated for all of their time worked. As a result, DEFENDANTS were able to and did
26 in fact unlawfully, and unilaterally round the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping
27 system for PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying
28 these employees for all their time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for

1 overtime worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, from
2 time to time, forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being
3 accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

4 47. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANT’S timekeeping system and unlawful
5 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’ time
6 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANTS’ unlawful rounding
7 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work
8 as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an
9 off-duty meal break.

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

11 48. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, PLAINTIFF and the
12 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were entitled to timely payment of wages during their
13 employment. PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time, did not
14 receive payment of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages,
15 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages within permissible time period.

16 49. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 201, “If an employer discharges an employee, the
17 wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.” Pursuant
18 to Cal. Lab. Code § 202, if an employee quits his or her employment, “his or her wages shall
19 become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72
20 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his
21 or her wages at the time of quitting.” PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
22 were, from time to time, not timely provided the wages earned and unpaid at the time of their
23 discharge and/or at the time of quitting, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201 and 202.

24 50. As such, PLAINTIFF demands up to thirty days of pay as penalty for not timely
25 paying all wages due at time of termination for all CALIFORNIA CLASS Members whose
26 employment ended during the CLASS PERIOD.

27 **K. Sick Pay Violations**

28 51. Cal. Labor Code Section 246 (a)(1) mandates that “An employee who, on or after

1 July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from
2 the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days as specified in this section.”
3 Further, Cal. Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements. From
4 time to time, DEFENDANTS failed to have a policy or practice in place that provided
5 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with sick days and/or paid sick
6 leave. As of January 1, 2024, Defendants failed to adhere to the law in that they failed to provide
7 and allow employees to use at least 40 hours or five days of paid sick leave per year.

8 52. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its
9 employees with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available.
10 From time to time, DEFENDANTS violated Cal. Lab. Code § 246 by failing to furnish
11 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements setting forth
12 the amount of paid sick leave available.

13 **L. Failure to Provide Personnel Files**

14 53. On March 25, 2024, PLAINTIFF caused a written request via certified mail to be
15 delivered to DEFENDANTS for PLAINTIFF’s personnel and employment records, including
16 but not limited to: (1) payroll records; (2) employment contracts; (3) itemized pay stubs; and (4)
17 PLAINTIFF’S complete employment file.

18 54. On April 16, 2024, PLAINTIFF caused a second written request via certified mail
19 to be delivered to DEFENDANTS for PLAINTIFF’s personnel and employment records,
20 including but not limited to: (1) payroll records; (2) employment contracts; (3) itemized pay stubs;
21 and (4) PLAINTIFF’s complete employment file.

22 55. DEFENDANTS failed to provide and/or make available to PLAINTIFF her
23 personnel records, payroll records, employment contract, and entire employment file within thirty
24 (30) days of her requests stated above. In fact, as of the date of filing of this complaint,
25 DEFENDANTS have still failed to pay PLAINTIFF the statutory penalty in the amount of \$750.
26 DEFENDANTS violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 1198.5 by failing to respond and provide
27 PLAINTIFF with her employment file. Section 1198.5 states that employees (and former
28 employees) have the right to inspect personnel records maintained by the employer “related to
the employee’s performance or to any grievance concerning the employee.” Employers must

1 allow inspection or copying within thirty (30) days of the request. PLAINTIFF is now entitled to
2 and requests injunctive relief to obtain compliance with Cal. Lab. Code Section 1198.5, a statutory
3 penalty, and an award of attorneys' fees and costs for bringing this action.

4 **M. Tip Pooling**

5 56. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS period, pursuant to DEFENDANTS' company
6 policies and practices, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were forced to
7 forfeit gratuities left for them by customers to DEFENDANTS' agents who provided no service
8 to the customers that resulted in the gratuity. DEFENDANTS routinely added gratuity tips and
9 service charges to its food and beverage bills. These gratuities and service charges reasonably
10 appear to be gratuities for the service staff. It is typical and customary in the hospitality industry
11 that establishments impose gratuity charges on the food and beverage bill. Thus, when customers
12 paid these charges, it is reasonable for them to have believed they were gratuities to be paid to
13 the service staff. Indeed, because many of these charges are depicted to customers, and the
14 custom in the food and beverage industry that gratuities are paid for food and beverage service,
15 customers paid these charges reasonably believing they were remitted to the service staff.
16 However, DEFENDANTS have not remitted the total proceeds of these gratuities to the non-
17 managerial employees who serve the food and beverages. Instead, DEFENDANTS have a policy
18 and practice of using a portion of these gratuities to pay managers or other non-service
19 employees. As a result, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have not received the
20 total proceeds of the gratuities, to which they are entitled to under California law.

21 57. DEFENDANTS are generally in the business of owning and operating a bar and
22 restaurant. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS Members were in the "chain of service" and earned gratuities based on their service for
24 their customers. However, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were forced to
25 forfeit portions of their gratuities, which said gratuities were kept by DEFENDANTS' employees
26 who were not in the chain of service from which the gratuity resulted. PLAINTIFF and other
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members contend that any gratuities kept by DEFENDANTS' non-
28 service employees were illegal and in violation of California law because PLAINTIFF and other

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members provided the service for to whom the gratuity should have been
2 paid.

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

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

15 60. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
16 off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for her rest and meal periods.
17 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5)
18 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to
19 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which she was required
20 by DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANTS provided
21 PLAINTIFF with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on-duty and on-call for the
22 rest break. DEFENDANTS policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during
23 what was supposed to be her off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and
24 rest breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS’ strict
25 corporate policy and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANTS also provided PLAINTIFF with
26 paystubs that failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANTS also failed
27 to reimburse PLAINTIFF for required business expenses related to the personal expenses
28 incurred for the use of her personal cell phone, on behalf of and in furtherance of her employment

1 with DEFENDANTS. To date, DEFENDANTS have not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum,
2 overtime and double time compensation still owed to her or any penalty wages owed to her under
3 Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed
4 the sum or value of \$75,000.

5 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

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

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

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

19 64. Common questions of law and fact regarding DEFENDANTS’ conduct, including
20 but not limited to, off-the-clock work, unpaid meal and rest period premiums, failure to accurately
21 calculate the regular rate of pay for overtime compensation, failure to accurately calculate the
22 regular rate of compensation for missed meal and rest period premiums, failing to provide legally
23 compliant meal and rest periods, failure to reimburse for business expenses, failure to provide
24 accurate itemized wage statements accurate, and failure to ensure they are paid at least minimum
25 wage and overtime, exist as to all members of the class and predominate over any questions
26 affecting solely any individual members of the class. Among the questions of law and fact
27 common to the class are:
28

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

25 65. PLAINTIFF is a member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as
26 a result of DEFENDANTS' conduct and actions alleged herein.

27 66. PLAINTIFF's claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and
28 PLAINTIFF has the same interests as the other members of the class.

1 67. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

3 68. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action
4 litigation.

5 69. Further, PLAINTIFF's interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the
6 interest of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 83. 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 84. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
5 DEFENDANTS have 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 DEFENDANTS so as to allow DEFENDANTS
9 to unfairly compete against competitors who comply with the law.

10 85. 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 86. 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 DEFENDANTS have 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 87. 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 DEFENDANTS from
23 engaging in any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

24 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no plain, speedy
25 and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business practices of
26 DEFENDANTS. 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 DEFENDANTS are 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 88. 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 89. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim
11 for DEFENDANTS' willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the
12 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANTS' failure to accurately calculate
13 and pay minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

14 90. 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 91. 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 92. 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 93. DEFENDANTS maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and
22 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time
23 they work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully
24 and intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of
25 the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

26 94. DEFENDANTS' 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 95. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANTS
4 inaccurately calculated the correct time worked and consequently underpaid the actual time
5 worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. DEFENDANTS 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 96. As a direct result of DEFENDANTS' 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 DEFENDANTS.

12 97. 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 98. By virtue of DEFENDANTS' 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 99. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
21 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under-compensated for their time worked.
22 DEFENDANTS 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 DEFENDANTS 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.

27 100. 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, DEFENDANTS 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.

7 101. 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 DEFENDANTS, 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, DEFENDANTS' 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. DEFENDANTS' 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)**

22 102. 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.

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

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

3 104. 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.

5 105. 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.

8 106. 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.

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

15 108. DEFENDANTS' 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.

22 109. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANTS
23 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
24 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANTS 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

1 110. As a direct result of DEFENDANTS' 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 DEFENDANTS.

4 111. 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 brings this Action on behalf of herself and the CALIFORNIA CLASS based on
10 DEFENDANTS' violations of non-negotiable, non-waivable rights provided by the State of
11 California.

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

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

22 114. By virtue of DEFENDANTS' 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.

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

1 DEFENDANTS 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 DEFENDANTS perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay
4 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct overtime wages for
5 their overtime worked.

6 116. 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, DEFENDANTS acted and continue 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.

14 117. 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 DEFENDANTS, 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, DEFENDANTS' 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. DEFENDANTS' 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 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

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

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

28

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

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

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

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

26
27
28 ///

1 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

5 122. 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.

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

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

27
28 ///

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

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

12 129. Further, from time to time, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately list the name and
13 address of the legal entity that is the employer for purposes of Cal. Lab. Code §226(a)(8).
14 DEFENDANTS' failure to accurately list the name and address of the legal entity that is the
15 employer violates Cal. Lab. Code §226(a)(8).

16 130. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANTS failed to provide itemized wage
17 statements to PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that complied with the
18 requirements of California Labor Code Section 226.

19 131. DEFENDANTS knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code
20 § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
21 CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct
22 wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which were not
23 properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult to estimate.
24 Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS may elect to recover
25 liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation
26 occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period
27 pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no
28

1 event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member
2 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

3 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

5 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

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

7 132. 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.

10 133. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

11 As used in this article:

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

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

21 135. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

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

137. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with
Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who
quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at

1 the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not
2 continue for more than 30 days.

3 138. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
4 terminated, and DEFENDANTS have not tendered payment of wages to these employees who
5 missed meal and rest breaks, as required by law.

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

11 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

13 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

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

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

18 141. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

19 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or
20 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
21 duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though
22 unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them
23 to be unlawful.

24 142. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS violated Cal. Lab.
25 Code § 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
26 members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANTS'
27 benefit. DEFENDANTS failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
28 members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, the use of their personal cell
phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANTS. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and
other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANTS to use their personal
cell phones to execute their essential job duties on behalf of DEFENDANTS. DEFENDANTS'

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

9 143. PLAINTIFF therefore demands reimbursement for expenditures or losses incurred
10 by her and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members in the discharge of their job duties for
11 DEFENDANTS, or their obedience to the directions of DEFENDANTS, with interest at the
12 statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

13 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **Failure To Pay Statutory Gratuities**

15 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 351 et seq.)**

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

17 144. 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.

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

27 146. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according to proof at trial,

1 including the loss of gratuities to which they were entitled. and seek all wages earned and due,
2 interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.

3 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

5 **(Cal. Lab. § 1198.5)**

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

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

13 149. On May 3, 2024, PLAINTIFF caused a written request via certified mail to be
14 delivered to DEFENDANT for PLAINTIFF’s personnel and employment records, including but
15 not limited to: (1) payroll records; (2) employment contracts; (3) itemized pay stubs; and (4)
16 PLAINTIFF’S complete employment file.

17 150. On June 12, 2024, PLAINTIFF caused a second written request via certified mail
18 to be delivered to DEFENDANT for PLAINTIFF’S personnel and employment records,
19 including but not limited to: (1) payroll records; (2) employment contracts; (3) itemized pay stubs;
20 and (4) PLAINTIFF’S complete employment file.

21 151. DEFENDANT failed to provide and/or make available to PLAINTIFF her
22 personnel records, payroll records, employment contract, and entire employment file within thirty
23 (30) days of her requests stated above. In fact, as of the date of filing of this complaint,
24 DEFENDANT has still failed to pay PLAINTIFF the statutory penalty in the amount of \$750.

25 152. PLAINTIFF is now entitled to and requests injunctive relief to obtain compliance
26 with Cal. Lab. Code Section 1198.5, a statutory penalty, and an award of attorneys’ fees and costs
27 for bringing this action.

28 ///

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

4 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

15 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

1
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

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 the Tenth Cause of Action:


- a. For an award of statutory damages as plead pursuant to Labor Code § 1198.5.
- b. For an injunction compelling production of Plaintiff’s employment records pursuant to Labor Code §1198.5.

4. On all claims:

- a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
- b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and
- c. An award of penalties, attorneys’ fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 218.5, § 226, § 246 and/or § 1194.

DATED: December 5, 2024

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: 

 Shani Zakay
 Attorney for PLAINTIFF

///


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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: December 5, 2024

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: 

Shani Zakay
Attorney for PLAINTIFF