

**SUMMONS
(CITACION JUDICIAL)**

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

XTREME AUTO COLLISION & GLASS INC., a California corporation,
and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:

(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

DIEGO BAUTISTA, an individual, on behalf of himself, and on behalf of
all persons similarly situated,

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

11/04/2022 at 02:53:56 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By Brandon Krause, Deputy Clerk

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), 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.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol/), 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.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol/) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales.

The name and address of the court is:

(El nombre y dirección de la corte es):

San Diego Superior Court - Hall of Justice Courthouse
330 West Broadway
San Diego, CA 92101

CASE NUMBER: 37-2022-00044708-CU-DE-CTL
(Número del Caso):

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:

(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq. SBN:248676 Tel: (619) 599-8292 Fax: (858) 599-8291
JCL Law Firm, APC - 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600, San Diego, CA 92121

DATE: 11/07/2022

(Fecha)

Clerk, by _____

(Secretario)



B. Krause

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)

(Para prueba de entrega de esta citación use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)).

NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

1. as an individual defendant.
2. as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):

3. on behalf of (specify):
 under: CCP 416.10 (corporation) CCP 416.60 (minor)
 CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
 CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) CCP 416.90 (authorized person)
 other (specify):
4. by personal delivery on (date):



1 **JCL LAW FIRM, APC**

2 Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
3 Sydney Castillo-Johnson (State Bar #343881)
4 Monnett De La Torre (State Bar #272884)
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
10 scastillo@jcl-lawfirm.com
11 mdelatorre@jcl-lawfirm.com

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego
11/04/2022 at 02:53:56 PM
Clerk of the Superior Court
By Brandon Krause, Deputy Clerk

12 **ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

13 Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
14 Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
15 Julieann Alvarado (State Bar #334727)
16 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
17 San Diego, CA 92121
18 Telephone: (619)255-9047
19 Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
20 shani@zakaylaw.com
21 jackland@zakaylaw.com
22 julieann@zakaylaw.com

23 Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

24 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

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

26 DIEGO BAUTISTA, an individual, on behalf
27 of himself, and on behalf of all persons
28 similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

XTREME AUTO COLLISION & GLASS
INC., a California corporation, and DOES 1-
50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No: 37-2022-00044708-CU-OE-CTL

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

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

- LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
- 6) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
 - 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
 - 8) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
 - 9) VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT [LABOR CODE §§ 2698 ET SEQ

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF DIEGO BAUTISTA (“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 XTREME AUTO COLLISION & GLASS INC. (“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, operates, and/or manages auto body repair facilities in the state of California, including in the county of San Diego, where DEFENDANT maintains its principal place of business.

3. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from November of 2021 to March of 2022 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 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

1 by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million 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 to 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 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
11 for off-the-clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
12 CLASS overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other
13 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS meal rest premiums at the regular rate, failed to reimburse
14 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for business expenses, and failed to issue
15 to PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with accurate itemized wage
16 statements showing, among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
17 periods and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANT’s
18 uniform policies and practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment
19 for all time worked as required by California law which allows DEFENDANT to illegally profit
20 and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who comply with the law. To the extent equitable
21 tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CLASS
22 PERIOD should be 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'Ss 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. Further,
16 DEFENDANT fails to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second
17 off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees are required by DEFENDANT
18 to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members does not qualify for the limited and narrowly construed "on-
20 duty" meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on premises, on
22 duty and on call. Further, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
23 Members to maintain cordless communication devices on them during meal periods in order to
24 receive and respond to work-related communications. DEFENDANT's failure to provide
25 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with legally required meal breaks is
26 evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records. PLAINTIFF and other members of the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in
28 accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

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 premises, on duty and/or on call.
12 Further, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to
13 maintain cordless communication devices on them during meal periods in order to receive and
14 respond to work-related communications. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
15 Members were also not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous
16 work schedules and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
17 CLASS Members were from time to time denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and
18 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. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were
6 required use their personal cell phones in order to perform work related tasks. However,
7 DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
8 Members for the use of their personal cell phones. As a result, in the course of their employment
9 with DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred
10 unreimbursed business expenses that included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of
11 their personal cell phones, all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

12 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

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

1 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that provided the correct
2 address of the legal entity that is the employer, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(8).

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

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

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

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

14 25. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
15 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
16 working, including but not limited to, cleaning and preparing work stations and helping
17 DEFENDANT close down its shop at the end of the day. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other
18 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to have to work while off-the-clock.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

18 **H. Unlawful Rounding Violations**

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

1 forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being accurately
2 recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

3 40. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANT’S timekeeping system and unlawful
4 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’ time
5 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANT’S unlawful rounding
6 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work
7 as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-
8 duty meal break. Additionally, DEFENDANT’S unlawful rounding policy and practice caused
9 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT
10 for more than ten (10) hours during a shift without receiving a second off-duty meal break.

11 **I. Unlawful Deductions**

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

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

1 of his personal cell phone, on behalf of and in furtherance of his employment with DEFENDANT.
2 To date, DEFENDANT has not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and double time
3 compensation still owed to him or any penalty wages owed to him under Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
4 The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of
5 \$75,000.

6 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

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

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

18 45. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
19 impractical.

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

- 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 47. PLAINTIFF are members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as
26 a result of DEFENDANT’s conduct and actions alleged herein.

27 48. PLAINTIFF’S claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and
28 PLAINTIFF have the same interests as the other members of the class.

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

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

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

7 52. 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 DEFENDANT are
9 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries
10 sustained.

11 53. 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 54. 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 the
18 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 60. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’s practices were unlawful and unfair
2 in that these practices violated public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive unscrupulous
3 or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or utility for which
4 this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section 17203 of the California
5 Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

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

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

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

28

1 65. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of himself 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 66. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
5 DEFENDANT has obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFF and the
6 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages for all time worked, and
7 has deprived them of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and contract, all to the
8 detriment of these employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANT so as to allow DEFENDANT
9 to unfairly compete against competitors who comply with the law.

10 67. 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 68. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are entitled to,
16 and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to restore to them the money and property which
17 DEFENDANT has acquired, or of which PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been deprived, by means of the above described unlawful and unfair
19 business practices, including earned but unpaid wages for all time worked.

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

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

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

3 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

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

7 71. 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 72. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
11 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
12 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to accurately calculate and pay
13 minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

14 73. 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 74. 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 75. 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 76. DEFENDANT maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the
22 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time they
23 work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and
24 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

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

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

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

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

12 80. 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 81. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
16 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the true
17 time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have
18 suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are presently unknown
19 to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

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

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

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

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

18 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

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

22 85. 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 86. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
26 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
27 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees for all
28

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

3 87. 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 88. 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 89. 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 90. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
13 were required by DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time
14 they worked, including overtime work.

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

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

28

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24
25 ///

26
27 ///

28 ///

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

3 108. 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)**

10 109. 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.

13 110. 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
unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them
to be unlawful.

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

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

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

10 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

12 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

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

14 113. 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.

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

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

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

9 115. When DEFENDANT did not accurately record PLAINTIFF'S and other
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurate missed
11 meal and rest break premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT violated Cal.
12 Lab. Code § 226 in that DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
13 CLASS Members with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other
14 things, all deductions, the accurate gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked
15 and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of
16 time worked at each hourly rate, and correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal
17 and rest periods. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and
18 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that provided the correct address of
19 the legal entity that is the employer, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(8).

20 116. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT failed to provide itemized wage
21 statements to PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that complied with the
22 requirements of California Labor Code Section 226.

23 117. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code
24 § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
25 CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct
26 wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which were not
27 properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult to estimate.
28 Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS may elect to recover

1 liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation
2 occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period
3 pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no
4 event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member
5 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

6 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

8 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

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

10 118. 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.

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

14 As used in this article:

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

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

24 121. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

25 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
26 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
27 thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention
28 to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.
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.

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

3 123. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

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

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

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

15 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

17 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§2698 et seq.)**

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

19 126. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth
20 herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

21 127. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state
22 labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who does so as the proxy or agent of
23 the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under PAGA is
24 fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to benefit private
25 parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution, but to create a means
26 of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code. In enacting
27 PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the public interest to allow aggrieved
28 employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for Labor Code

1 violations ..." (Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1). Accordingly, PAGA claims cannot be subject to
2 arbitration.

3 128. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
4 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
5 Act, bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to himself
6 and all employees who worked for Defendant in California during the time period of August 18,
7 2021 until the present (the "AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES").

8 129. On August 18, 2022, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by certified mail to the
9 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and the employer of the specific
10 provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. See
11 Exhibit #1, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference herein. The statutory waiting
12 period for Plaintiff to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant
13 to Section 2699.3, Plaintiff may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA
14 pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED
15 EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

16 130. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
17 business act or practice because DEFENDANTS (a) failed to pay AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
18 minimum wages and overtime wages, (b) failed to provide AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES legally
19 required meal and rest breaks, (c) failed to pay AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at the correct
20 regular rate of pay, (d) failed to pay AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, and (e)
21 failed to timely pay wages, all in violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor
22 Code §2699.5, including but not limited to Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5,
23 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
24 1197.14, 1198, 1199, 2802, 2804, and the applicable Industrial Wage Order(s), and thereby gives
25 rise to statutory penalties as a result of such conduct. PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of civil
26 penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the
27 representative of the State of California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFF and
28 the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

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

- 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:
 - a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
 - b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory damages for overtime compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;
 - c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;
 - d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding

- 1 an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for
2 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226
3 e. The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a
4 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action
5 therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
6 f. The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the CALIFORNIA
7 CLASS incurred in the course of their job duties, plus interest, and costs of suit.
8 3. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to all AGGRIEVED
9 EMPLOYEES: Recovery of civil penalties as prescribe by the Labor Code Private
10 Attorneys General Act of 2004;
11 4. On all claims:
12 a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
13 b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and
14 c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law,
15 including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 218.5, § 226, and/or § 1194.

16
17 DATED: October 28, 2022

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

By: _____

Jean-Claude Lapuyade
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: October 28, 2022

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

By: _____

Jean-Claude Lapuyade
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

EXHIBIT 1



Client # 52801

August 19, 2022

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

XTREME AUTO COLLISION & GLASS INC.

c/o American Incorporation Services Inc
1817 Morena Blvd STE A
San Diego, CA 92110

Sent via Certified Mail and Return Receipt 7021 1970 0001 8870 0760

Re: Notice of Violations of California Labor Code Sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2804, Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.5

Dear Sir/Madam:

Our offices represent Plaintiff DIEGO BAUTISTA (“Plaintiff”), and other aggrieved employees in a proposed lawsuit against Defendant XTREME AUTO COLLISION & GLASS INC. (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from November of 2021 to March of 2022 as non-exempt employees, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to payment of all wages and the legally required meal and rest breaks and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for all of their time worked, and for all of their meal breaks and rest breaks. Further, Defendant failed to timely pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for earned wages.

As a consequence, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to fully compensate him and other similarly situated and aggrieved employees, for all earned wages and failed to provide California-compliant meal and rest breaks and accurate wage statements. Accordingly, Plaintiff contends that Defendant’s conduct violated Labor Code sections §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1199, 2802, 2804, and applicable wage orders, and is therefore actionable pursuant to section 2698 *et seq.*

Plaintiff seeks to represent a group of aggrieved employees defined as all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in California during the relevant claim period.

A true and correct copy of the proposed Complaint is attached hereto. The Complaint (i) identifies the alleged violations, (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (iii) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (iv) sets forth the people/entities,

dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to the Plaintiff, and (v) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendant, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

To the extent that entities and/or individuals are named and charged with violations of the Labor Code—making them liable on an individual basis as permitted by numerous Labor Code Sections including, but not limited to 558, 558.1, and 1197.1—Plaintiff reserves any and all rights to add, substitute, or change the name of employer entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations at issue.

Any further amendments and changes to this notice shall relate back to the date of this notice. Consequently, Defendant is on notice that Plaintiff continues his investigation, with the full intent to amend and/or change this notice, to add any undiscovered violations of any of the provisions of the California Labor Code—to the extent that are applicable to this case—and to change and/or add the identities of any entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations contained herein.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with the Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2695, *et seq.* The lawsuit consists of other aggrieved employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims as alleged in the Complaint, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Act of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all aggrieved California employees.

Your earliest response to this notice is appreciated. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and address.

Sincerely,



Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for Plaintiff

1 **JCL LAW FIRM, APC**

2 Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
3 Eduardo Garcia (State Bar #290572)
4 Sydney Castillo-Johnson (State Bar #343881)
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
10 egarcia@jcl-lawfirm.com
11 scastillo@jcl-lawfirm.com

12 **ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

13 Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
14 Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
15 Julieann Alvarado (State Bar #334727)
16 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
17 San Diego, CA 92121
18 Telephone: (619)255-9047
19 Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
20 shani@zakaylaw.com
21 jackland@zakaylaw.com
22 julieann@zakaylaw.com

23 Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

24 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

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

26 DIEGO BAUTISTA, an individual, on behalf
27 of himself, and on behalf of all persons
28 similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

XTREME AUTO COLLISION & GLASS
INC., a California corporation, and DOES 1-
50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1) UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §17200 *et seq*;
- 2) FAILURE TO PAY 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;

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

- 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 WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
- 8) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF DIEGO BAUTISTA (“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 XTREME AUTO COLLISION & GLASS INC. (“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, operates, and/or manages auto body repair facilities in the state of California, including in the county of San Diego, where DEFENDANT maintains its principal place of business.

3. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from November of 2021 to March of 2022 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 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

1 by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million 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 to 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 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
11 for off-the-clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
12 CLASS overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other
13 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS meal rest premiums at the regular rate, failed to reimburse
14 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for business expenses, and failed to issue
15 to PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with accurate itemized wage
16 statements showing, among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
17 periods and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANT’s
18 uniform policies and practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment
19 for all time worked as required by California law which allows DEFENDANT to illegally profit
20 and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who comply with the law. To the extent equitable
21 tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CLASS
22 PERIOD should be 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'Ss 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. Further,
16 DEFENDANT fails to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second
17 off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees are required by DEFENDANT
18 to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members does not qualify for the limited and narrowly construed "on-
20 duty" meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on premises, on
22 duty and on call. Further, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
23 Members to maintain cordless communication devices on them during meal periods in order to
24 receive and respond to work-related communications. DEFENDANT's failure to provide
25 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with legally required meal breaks is
26 evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records. PLAINTIFF and other members of the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in
28 accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

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 premises, on duty and/or on call.
12 Further, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to
13 maintain cordless communication devices on them during meal periods in order to receive and
14 respond to work-related communications. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
15 Members were also not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous
16 work schedules and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
17 CLASS Members were from time to time denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and
18 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. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were
6 required use their personal cell phones in order to perform work related tasks. However,
7 DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
8 Members for the use of their personal cell phones. As a result, in the course of their employment
9 with DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred
10 unreimbursed business expenses that included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of
11 their personal cell phones, all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

12 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

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

1 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that provided the correct
2 address of the legal entity that is the employer, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(8).

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

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

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

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

14 25. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
15 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
16 working, including but not limited to, cleaning and preparing work stations and helping
17 DEFENDANT close down its shop at the end of the day. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other
18 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to have to work while off-the-clock.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

18 **H. Unlawful Rounding Violations**

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

1 forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being accurately
2 recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

3 40. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANT’S timekeeping system and unlawful
4 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’ time
5 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANT’S unlawful rounding
6 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work
7 as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-
8 duty meal break. Additionally, DEFENDANT’S unlawful rounding policy and practice caused
9 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT
10 for more than ten (10) hours during a shift without receiving a second off-duty meal break.

11 **I. Unlawful Deductions**

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

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

1 of his personal cell phone, on behalf of and in furtherance of his employment with DEFENDANT.
2 To date, DEFENDANT has not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and double time
3 compensation still owed to him or any penalty wages owed to him under Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
4 The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of
5 \$75,000.

6 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

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

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

18 45. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
19 impractical.

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

- 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 47. PLAINTIFF are members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as
26 a result of DEFENDANT's conduct and actions alleged herein.

27 48. PLAINTIFF'S claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and
28 PLAINTIFF have the same interests as the other members of the class.

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

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

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

7 52. 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 DEFENDANT are
9 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries
10 sustained.

11 53. 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 54. 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 the
18 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 60. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’s practices were unlawful and unfair
2 in that these practices violated public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive unscrupulous
3 or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or utility for which
4 this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section 17203 of the California
5 Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

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

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

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

28

1 65. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of himself 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 66. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
5 DEFENDANT has obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFF and the
6 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages for all time worked, and
7 has deprived them of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and contract, all to the
8 detriment of these employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANT so as to allow DEFENDANT
9 to unfairly compete against competitors who comply with the law.

10 67. 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 68. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are entitled to,
16 and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to restore to them the money and property which
17 DEFENDANT has acquired, or of which PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been deprived, by means of the above described unlawful and unfair
19 business practices, including earned but unpaid wages for all time worked.

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

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

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

3 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

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

7 71. 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 72. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
11 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
12 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to accurately calculate and pay
13 minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

14 73. 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 74. 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 75. 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 76. DEFENDANT maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the
22 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time they
23 work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and
24 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

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

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

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

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

12 80. 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 81. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
16 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the true
17 time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have
18 suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are presently unknown
19 to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

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

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

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

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

18 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

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

22 85. 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 86. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
26 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
27 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees for all
28

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

3 87. 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 88. 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 89. 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 90. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
13 were required by DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time
14 they worked, including overtime work.

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

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

28

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

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

5 109. 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.

8 110. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:
9 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or
10 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
11 duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though
12 unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them
13 to be unlawful.

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

- 1 h. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
- 2 i. all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
- 3 number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

4 115. When DEFENDANT did not accurately record PLAINTIFF’S and other
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’ missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurate missed
6 meal and rest break premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT violated Cal.
7 Lab. Code § 226 in that DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
8 CLASS Members with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other
9 things, all deductions, the accurate gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked
10 and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of
11 time worked at each hourly rate, and correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal
12 and rest periods. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and
13 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that provided the correct address of
14 the legal entity that is the employer, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(8).

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

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

1 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

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

5 118. 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.

8 119. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

9 As used in this article:

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

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

19 121. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

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

31 123. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

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

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

the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;


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

3. On all claims:

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

DATED: August 19, 2022

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: 
Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for PLAINTIFF


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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: August 19, 2022

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: 
Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com

OFFICIAL USE

7021 1470 0001 8870 0760

Certified Mail Fee	
Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Return Receipt (hardcopy)	\$ _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Return Receipt (electronic)	\$ _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Mail Restricted Delivery	\$ _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Adult Signature Required	\$ _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Adult Signature Restricted Delivery	\$ _____
Postage	\$ _____
Total Postage and Fees	\$ _____
Postmark Here	002-358 8/19 Baurista
Sent Via <u>Express Mail</u>	
Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No. <u>2700 S. 2nd St. #200</u>	
City, State, ZIP+4® <u>Atlanta, GA 30334</u>	
PS Form 3800, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9007 See Reverse for Instructions	

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

Xtreme Auto Collision & Glassing, Inc
 c/o American Incorporation Service, Inc.
 1817 Marana Blvd, Ste A
 San Diego, CA 92110



9590 9402 7420 2055 3638 54

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7021 1970 0001 8870 0760

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

[Handwritten Signature]

- Agent
- Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

Jaanne Chevillon

C. Date of Delivery

- D. Is delivery address different from item 1? Yes
 If YES, enter delivery address below: No

8/19/22 Bautista 002-358

3. Service Type

- Adult Signature
- Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
- Certified Mail®
- Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
- Collect on Delivery
- Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
- Priority Mail Express®
- Registered Mail™
- Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
- Signature Confirmation™
- Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery