

**SUMMONS  
(CITACION JUDICIAL)**

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

Electronically FILED by  
Superior Court of California,  
County of Los Angeles  
6/27/2024 2:10 PM  
David W. Slayton,  
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,  
By J. Covarrubias, Deputy Clerk

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

SECOND STREET CORPORATION dba THE HUNTLEY HOTEL, a California corporation;  
and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

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

JASON MARELLO, an individual, on behalf of himself, 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](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp)), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

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

Stanely Mosk Courthouse - 111 N. Hill Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

CASE NUMBER:  
(Número del Caso):

**24STCV16122**

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court

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: 06/27/2024  
(Fecha)

Clerk, by J. Covarrubias, 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)).



**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 Monnett De La Torre (State Bar #272884)  
4 Andrea A. Amaya Silva (State Bar #348080)  
5 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600  
6 San Diego, CA 92121  
7 Telephone: (619) 599-8292  
8 Facsimile: (619) 599-8291  
9 [jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com](mailto:jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com)  
10 [mdelatorre@jcl-lawfirm.com](mailto:mdelatorre@jcl-lawfirm.com)  
11 [aamaya@jcl-lawfirm.com](mailto:aamaya@jcl-lawfirm.com)

Electronically FILED by  
Superior Court of California,  
County of Los Angeles  
6/27/2024 2:10 PM  
David W. Slayton,  
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,  
By J. Covarrubias, Deputy Clerk

8 **ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**  
9 Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)  
10 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600  
11 San Diego, CA 92121  
12 Telephone: (619) 255-9047  
13 Facsimile: (858) 404-9203  
14 [shani@zakaylaw.com](mailto:shani@zakaylaw.com)

15 Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

16 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

17 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

18 JASON MARELLO, an individual, on behalf of  
19 himself, and on behalf of all persons similarly  
20 situated,

21 Plaintiffs,

22 v.

23 SECOND STREET CORPORATION, dba  
24 THE HUNTLEY HOTEL, a California  
25 corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

26 Defendants.

Case No: **24STCV16122**

**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 REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
- 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
- 8) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203.
- 9) FAILURE TO PROVIDE GRATUITIES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 351.

**DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

PLAINTIFF JASON MARELLO (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated current and former employees, allege on information and belief, except for his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

**PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

1. Defendant SECOND STREET CORPORATION dba THE HUNTLEY HOTEL (“Defendant”) is a California corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

2. DEFENDANT owns and operates a hotel in the state of California, including the county of Los Angeles, where PLAINTIFF worked.

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

4. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class, defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Second Street Corporation in California and classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”). The amount in

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 10. DEFENDANT'S uniform policies and practices alleged herein were unlawful,  
15 unfair, and deceptive business practices whereby DEFENDANT retained and continue to retain  
16 wages due to PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

17 11. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction  
18 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and  
19 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who has been economically injured by  
20 DEFENDANT'S past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable  
21 relief.

## 22 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

27 13. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,  
28 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANT operates in locations across California, employs

1 the CALIFORNIA CLASS across California, including in this County, and committed the  
2 wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

3 **THE CONDUCT**

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

23 **A. Meal Period Violations**

24 15. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was  
25 required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,  
26 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including  
27 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the CLASS  
28 PERIOD, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work

1 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT’s control. Specifically,  
2 DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be  
3 PLAINTIFF’s off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not  
4 even receive a partial lunch. As a result, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
5 Members forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their  
6 time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and  
7 overtime rates. DEFENDANT’s uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other  
8 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business  
9 records.

10           16. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work  
11 schedules and DEFENDANT’s inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other  
12 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty  
13 meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other  
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for  
15 more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. The nature of the  
16 work performed by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members does not qualify for  
17 the limited and narrowly construed “on-duty” meal period exception. When they were provided  
18 with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to  
19 time, required to remain on duty and on call. Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time required  
20 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to maintain cordless communication  
21 devices in order to receive and respond to work-related communications during what was  
22 supposed to be their off-duty meal breaks. DEFENDANT’s failure to provide PLAINTIFF and  
23 the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with legally required meal breaks is evidenced by  
24 DEFENDANT’s business records. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
25 therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with  
26 DEFENDANT’s strict corporate policy and practice.

27  
28 ///

1     **B. Rest Period Violations**

2           17. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other  
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without  
4 being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and  
5 DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons, these employees were denied  
6 their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four  
7 (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some  
8 shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and  
9 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from  
10 time to time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA  
11 CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and/or on call. Further,  
12 DEFENDANTS from time to time required PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
13 Members to maintain cordless communication devices in order to receive and respond to work-  
14 related communications during what was supposed to be their off-duty rest breaks. PLAINTIFF  
15 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu*  
16 thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing,  
17 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time denied their  
18 proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

19     **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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



1 even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them  
2 to be unlawful."

3 19. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other  
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to use their personal cell phones as a result of and in furtherance  
5 of their job duties, including but not limited to receiving and/or responding to work-related  
6 communications and performing work-related duties. However, DEFENDANT unlawfully failed  
7 to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the use of their personal  
8 cell phones. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFF  
9 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred unreimbursed business expenses that  
10 included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cell phones.

11 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

12 20. 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 21. 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, or all tips earned,  
23 DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members  
24 with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all  
25 deductions, the total hours worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period  
26 and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty  
27 payments or missed meal and rest periods.

28 ///

1           22. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide  
2 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with  
3 Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

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

9           24. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT failed and  
10 continues to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
11 for all hours worked.

12           25. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required  
13 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift  
14 work, including but not limited to, opening and closing keyholder duties and assisting  
15 DEFENDANT'S customers. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other members of the  
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS to have to work while off-the-clock.

17           26. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-  
18 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

19           27. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,  
20 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

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

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

28 ///

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

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

9           32. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
10 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT’s direction, control, and  
11 benefit for the time spent working while off-the-clock. DEFENDANT’s uniform policy and  
12 practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all  
13 hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business  
14 records.

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

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

26           34. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times  
27 their “regular rate of pay.” PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were  
28

1 compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an  
2 employee's performance.

3 35. The second component of PLAINTIFF'S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
4 Members' compensation was DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary incentive program that paid  
5 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their  
6 performance for DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees  
7 paid on an hourly basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various  
8 performance goals set by DEFENDANTS.

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

27 37. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the  
28 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a

1 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to  
2 compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS at the correct rate  
3 of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed  
4 sick pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain  
5 an unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable tolling  
6 operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members against DEFENDANT, the  
7 CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

8 **G. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages**

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

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

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

25 **H. Unlawful Deductions**

26 41. DEFENDANT, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF  
27 and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’ pay without explanations and without authorization to do  
28

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

3 **I. Timekeeping Manipulation**

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

13 43. 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 44. The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed DEFENDANT to alter  
17 employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in DEFENDANT’S  
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 45. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
24 forfeited wages due them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT’S direction, control and benefit  
25 for the time the timekeeping system was inoperable. DEFENDANT’S 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 DEFENDANT’S business  
28 records.

1 **J. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

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

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

20 **K. Sick Pay Violations**

21 48. Cal. Labor Code Section 246 (a)(1) mandates that "An employee who, on or after  
22 July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from  
23 the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days as specified in this section."  
24 Further, Cal. Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements. From  
25 time to time, DEFENDANT failed to have a policy or practice in place that provided PLAINTIFF  
26 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with sick days and/or paid sick leave.

27 49. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its  
28 employees with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available.

1 From time to time, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 246 by failing to furnish PLAINTIFF  
2 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements setting forth the amount  
3 of paid sick leave available.

4 **L. Tip Pooling**

5 50. 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 the  
13 service staff. Indeed, because many of these charges are depicted to customers, and the custom in  
14 the food and beverage industry that gratuities are paid for food and beverage service, customers  
15 paid these charges reasonably believing they were remitted to the service staff. However,  
16 DEFENDANTS have not remitted the total proceeds of these gratuities to the non-managerial  
17 employees who serve the food and beverages. Instead, DEFENDANTS have a policy and practice  
18 of using a portion of these gratuities to pay managers or other non-service employees. As a result,  
19 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have not received the total proceeds of the  
20 gratuities, to which they are entitled to under California law.

21 51. DEFENDANTS are generally in the business of owning and operating a restaurant.  
22 During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
23 Members were in the "chain of service" and earned gratuities based on their service for their  
24 customers. However, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were forced to forfeit  
25 portions of their gratuities, which said gratuities were kept by DEFENDANTS' employees who  
26 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 52. California Labor Code § 351 establishes the requirements for an employer  
4 regarding the payment of gratuities. Specifically, gratuities are the sole property of the employees.  
5 California Labor Code § 351 expressly prohibits employers and their agents from collecting,  
6 taking, or receiving any portion of a gratuity. California Labor Code § 350(e) defines the term  
7 “gratuity” as including any money that has been paid or given or left for an employee by a patron  
8 of a business over and above the actual amount due the business for services rendered or for  
9 goods, food, drink or articles sold or served to such patron. Labor Code § 353 requires employers  
10 to keep accurate records of all gratuities they receive, directly or indirectly.

11 53. 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 54. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take  
16 off duty meal and rest breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for his rest and meal periods.  
17 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5)  
18 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to  
19 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which they were  
20 required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANT provided  
21 PLAINTIFF with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on-duty and on-call for the  
22 rest break. DEFENDANT’s policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during what  
23 was supposed to be his off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest  
24 breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT’S strict corporate  
25 policy and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANT also provided PLAINTIFF with paystubs that  
26 failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANT also failed to reimburse  
27 PLAINTIFF for required business expenses related to the use of his personal cell phone and home  
28 internet on behalf of and in furtherance of his employment with DEFENDANT. DEFENDANTS

1 further failed to pay and/or improperly withheld tips from PLAINTIFFS. To date, DEFENDANT  
2 has not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed  
3 to him or any penalty wages owed to him under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy  
4 for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

5 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

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

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

19 57. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is  
20 impractical.

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

1 any questions affecting solely any individual members of the class. Among the questions of law  
2 and fact common to the class are:

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

27  
28 ///

1 k. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition in violation of the  
2 UCL, by failing to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

4 59. PLAINTIFF are members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as  
5 a result of DEFENDANT's conduct and actions alleged herein.

6 60. PLAINTIFF'S claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and  
7 PLAINTIFF have the same interests as the other members of the class.

8 61. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the  
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

10 62. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action  
11 litigation.

12 63. Further, PLAINTIFF'S interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the  
13 interest of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

14 64. There is a strong community of interest among PLAINTIFF and the members of  
15 the CALIFORNIA CLASS to, inter alia, ensure that the combined assets of DEFENDANT are  
16 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries  
17 sustained.

18 65. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members  
19 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, including legal and factual  
20 issues relating to liability and damages.

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

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

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

8 67. Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring an  
9 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims arising out of  
10 the conduct of DEFENDANT.

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **Unlawful Business Practices**

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

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

15 68. 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 69. DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. And Prof.  
19 Code § 17021.

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

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

///  
28

1           71. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to  
2 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the  
3 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code  
4 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and  
5 2802, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal.  
6 Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to  
7 constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

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

22           74. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful,  
23 unfair, and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's employment practices caused PLAINTIFF and the  
24 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with  
25 DEFENDANT.

26           75. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unfair and  
27 deceptive in that DEFENDANT's uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide  
28

1 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members as  
2 required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

3 76. Therefore, PLAINTIFF demands on behalf of himself and on behalf of each  
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty meal  
5 period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of pay for  
6 each workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for each ten (10)  
7 hours of work.

8 77. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of himself and on behalf of each  
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which a rest period  
10 was not timely provided as required by law.

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

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

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

27 81. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are further  
28 entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the described business practices are unlawful, unfair,

1 and deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining DEFENDANT from  
2 engaging in any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

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

10 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

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

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

17 84. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim  
18 for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the  
19 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to accurately calculate  
20 and pay minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

23 86. Cal. Lab. Code § 1197 provides the minimum wage for employees fixed by the  
24 commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than  
25 the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

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

28 ///



1           88. DEFENDANT maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the  
2 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time they  
3 work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and  
4 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

6           89. DEFENDANT's uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,  
7 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of  
8 implementing a uniform policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF  
9 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in regard to minimum wage pay.

10           90. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT  
11 inaccurately calculated the correct time worked and consequently underpaid the actual time  
12 worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. DEFENDANTS  
13 acted in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in  
14 violation of the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and  
15 other applicable laws and regulations.

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

19           92. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked than they were entitled to, constituting a  
21 failure to pay all earned wages.

22           93. 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 time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have  
25 suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are presently unknown  
26 to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

27           94. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other  
28 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under-compensated for their time worked.

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

6 95. 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 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  
12 legal rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the  
13 expense of these employees.

14 96. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore request  
15 recovery of all unpaid 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 minimum wage  
18 compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have  
19 terminated their employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or  
20 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab.  
21 Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA CLASS  
22 Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good  
23 faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are entitled to seek and  
24 recover statutory costs.

25  
26  
27  
28 ///



1 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked,  
2 including, the overtime work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve  
3 (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

4 104. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT  
5 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by  
6 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANT acted in an illegal  
7 attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California  
8 Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and  
9 regulations.

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

13 106. Cal. Lab. Code § 515 sets out various categories of employees who are exempt  
14 from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to  
15 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Further, PLAINTIFF and the  
16 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are not subject to a valid collective bargaining  
17 agreement that would preclude the causes of action contained herein this Complaint. Rather,  
18 PLAINTIFF brings this Action on behalf of himself and the CALIFORNIA CLASS based on  
19 DEFENDANT's violations of non-negotiable, non-waivable rights provided by the State of  
20 California.

21 107. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for overtime worked than they were entitled to,  
23 constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

24 108. DEFENDANT failed to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which was in excess of the  
26 maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, & 1198, even  
27 though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were regularly  
28 required to work, and did in fact work overtime, and did in fact work overtime as to which

1 DEFENDANT failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANT's business  
2 records and witnessed by employees.

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

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

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

23 112. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
24 request recovery of overtime wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the  
25 assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the  
26 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent overtime compensation is  
27 determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have terminated their  
28 employment, DEFENDANT'S conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and

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

5 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

7 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

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

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

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

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

4 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

6 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

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

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

25 119. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable  
26 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members  
27 who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, one  
28

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

3 120. 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 Reimburse Employees For Required Expenses**

8 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

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

10 121. 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.

13 122. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

14 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or  
15 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her  
16 duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though  
17 unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them  
18 to be unlawful.

19 123. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab.  
20 Code § 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
21 members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANT's  
22 benefit. DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
23 members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, their personal cell phones as a  
24 result of and in furtherance of their job duties, including but not limited to receiving and/or  
25 responding to work-related communications and performing work-related duties. Specifically,  
26 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANTS to  
27 use their personal cell phones to execute their essential job duties on behalf of DEFENDANT.  
28 DEFENDANT's uniform policy, practice and procedure was to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and  
the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for expenses resulting from using their personal cell phones  
for DEFENDANT within the course and scope of their employment for DEFENDANT. These



1 expenses were necessary to complete their principal job duties. DEFENDANT is estopped by  
2 DEFENDANT’s conduct to assert any waiver of this expectation. Although these expenses were  
3 necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members,  
4 DEFENDANT failed to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
5 members for these expenses as an employer is required to do under the laws and regulations of  
6 California.

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

11 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

13 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

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

15 125. 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.

18 126. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with an  
19 “accurate itemized” statement in writing showing:

- 20 a. Gross wages earned,
- 21 b. (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose  
22 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of  
23 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the  
24 Industrial Welfare Commission,
- 25 c. the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee  
26 is paid on a piece-rate basis,
- 27 d. all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee  
28 may be aggregated and shown as one item,

- e. net wages earned,
- f. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
- g. the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number of an employee identification number other than social security number may be shown on the itemized statement,
- h. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
- i. all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

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

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

129. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult to estimate. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS may elect to recover liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the

1 violation occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay  
2 period pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but  
3 in no event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective  
4 member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

5 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

7 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

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

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

12 131. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

13 As used in this article:

- 14 (d) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of every  
15 description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time,  
16 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  
19 paid for is performed personally by the person demanding payment.

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

23 133. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

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



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 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

6 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

17 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 18 a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth and  
19 Ninth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action  
20 pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- 21 b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory  
22 damages for overtime compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of  
23 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest  
24 thereon at the statutory rate;
- 25 c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and  
26 the applicable IWC Wage Order;
- 27 d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in  
28 which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the

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

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 sui

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: June 27, 2024

**JCL LAW FIRM, APC**

By:   
Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.  
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

**DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

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

DATED: June 27, 2024

**JCL LAW FIRM, APC**

By:   
Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.  
Attorney for PLAINTIFF