

**JCL LAW FIRM, APC**

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)  
Eduardo Garcia (State Bar #290572)  
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600  
San Diego, CA 92121  
Telephone: (619) 599-8292  
Facsimile: (619) 599-8291  
[jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com](mailto:jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com)  
[egarcia@jcl-lawfirm.com](mailto:egarcia@jcl-lawfirm.com)

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**

Superior Court of California,  
County of San Diego

**02/04/2022** at 02:28:04 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court  
By Elizabeth Reyes, Deputy Clerk

**ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)  
Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)  
Julieann Alvarado (State Bar #334727)  
5440 Morehouse Dr., Ste 3600  
San Diego, CA 92121  
Telephone: (619)255-9047  
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203  
[shani@zakaylaw.com](mailto:shani@zakaylaw.com)  
[jackland@zakaylaw.com](mailto:jackland@zakaylaw.com)  
[julieann@zakaylaw.com](mailto:julieann@zakaylaw.com)

Attorneys for Plaintiff NICHOLAS KALUZA

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

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

NICHOLAS KALUZA, an individual, on behalf of himself and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

BOEING AEROSPACE OPERATIONS, INC., a Delaware Corporation; THE BOEING COMPANY, a Delaware Corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No: 37-2022-00004602-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;

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
  - 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
  - 8) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE §2802.

**DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

8 Plaintiff NICHOLAS KALUZA (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of himself and all  
9 other similarly situated current and former employees, alleges on information and belief, except for  
10 his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

11 **THE PARTIES**

12 1. Defendant BOEING AEROSPACE OPERATIONS, INC. (“Defendant Boeing  
13 Aerospace”) is a Delaware corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and  
14 continues to conduct substantial and regular business in the state of California.

15 2. Defendant THE BOEING COMPANY (“Defendant Boeing Company”) is a  
16 Delaware corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to  
17 conduct substantial and regular business in the state of California.

18 3. Defendant Boeing Aerospace and Defendant Boeing Company were the joint  
19 employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the contracts signed and by the company the  
20 PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively, and are therefore jointly responsible as employers  
21 for the conduct alleged herein and collectively referred to herein as “DEFENDANTS” and/or  
22 “DEFENDANT.”

23 4. DEFENDANTS design, manufacture and sell aircrafts and telecommunications  
24 equipment in the State of California, including at the San Diego, California location where  
25 PLAINTIFF worked.

26 5. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,  
27 partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently  
28 unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names pursuant

1 to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege the  
2 true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are ascertained.  
3 PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that  
4 the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, (hereinafter  
5 collectively “DEFENDANTS” and/or “DEFENDANT”) are responsible in some manner for one  
6 or more of the events and happenings that proximately caused the injuries and damages  
7 hereinafter alleged.

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

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

22         8.       DEFENDANTS were PLAINTIFF’s employers or persons acting on behalf of  
23 PLAINTIFF’s employer either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person,  
24 within the meaning of California Labor Code § 1197.1, who paid or caused to be paid to any  
25 employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by California state law, and as such, are subject to  
26 civil penalties for each underpaid employee

27         9.       PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in California from April of 2021  
28 to January of 2022 and was at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee,

1 paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of  
2 minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

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

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

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

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



1     **A. Meal Period Violations**

2           17. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANTS  
3 were required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,  
4 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including  
5 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time-to-time during the CLASS  
6 PERIOD, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work  
7 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANTS' control. Specifically, as a  
8 result of PLAINTIFF's demanding work requirements and DEFENDANT'S understaffing,  
9 DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to  
10 be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was from time to time interrupted by work  
11 assignments while clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break.  
12 Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not even receive a partial lunch. More  
13 specifically, from time to time, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were  
14 required by DEFENDANTS to work through their meal breaks in order to meet DEFENDANTS'  
15 prescribed labor hours to perform all the tasks required of them by DEFENDANTS. PLAINTIFF  
16 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to perform tasks such as, including but  
17 not limited to, working flight lines, fixing aircrafts or assisting DEFENDANTS' supervisors with  
18 various aircraft-related tasks. Additionally, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
19 Members were required to perform as much work as possible and as quickly as possible in order  
20 to meet DEFENDANTS' strict performance and production requirements. As a result, the  
21 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited minimum wage and overtime  
22 wages by regularly working without their time being accurately recorded and without  
23 compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates. DEFENDANTS' uniform  
24 policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all  
25 time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

26           18. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work  
27 requirements and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other  
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off-

1 duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and  
2 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required from time to time to perform work as  
3 ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a  
4 meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and  
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which  
6 these employees were required by DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work from time to  
7 time. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
8 Members does not qualify for limited and narrowly construed “on-duty” meal period exception.  
9 When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
10 Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call. PLAINTIFF and other  
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional  
12 compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS’ strict corporate policy and practice.

13 **B. Rest Period Violations**

14 19. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other  
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were also required from time to time to work in excess of four  
16 (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work  
17 requirements and DEFENDANTS’ inadequate staffing. More specifically, from time to time,  
18 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANTS to  
19 work through their rest breaks in order to meet DEFENDANTS’ prescribed labor hours to perform  
20 all the tasks required of them by DEFENDANTS. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
21 Members were required to perform tasks such as, including but not limited to, working flight  
22 lines, fixing aircrafts or assisting DEFENDANTS’ supervisors with various aircraft-related tasks.  
23 Additionally, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to perform  
24 as much work as possible and as quickly as possible in order to meet DEFENDANTS’ strict  
25 performance and production requirements. Further, for the same reasons these employees were  
26 denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2)  
27 to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for  
28 some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second

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

8 **C. Unlawful Rounding Violations**

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

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



1 DEFENDANTS for more than ten (10) hours during a shift without receiving a second off-duty  
2 meal break.

3 **D. Regular Rate Violation – Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums, and**  
4 **Sick Pay**

5 22. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed and  
6 continue to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
7 members for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and  
8 sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members forfeited wages  
9 due them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime and double time  
10 rates, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay rates. DEFENDANTS’ uniform policy and  
11 practice to not pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS members the correct rate for all overtime and  
12 double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay in accordance with applicable  
13 law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS’ business records.

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

18 24. The second component of PLAINTIFF’S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
19 members’ compensation was DEFENDANTS’ non-discretionary incentive program that paid  
20 PLAINTIFF and other CLASS MEMBERS incentive wages based on their performance for  
21 DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly  
22 basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by  
23 DEFENDANTS.

24 25. However, from-time-to-time, when calculating the regular rate of pay, in those pay  
25 periods where PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members worked overtime, double  
26 time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or paid sick pay, and earned non-  
27 discretionary bonus, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus  
28 compensation as part of the employees’ “regular rate of pay” and/or calculated all hours worked

1 rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the  
2 incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.  
3 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA  
4 CLASS members must be included in the “regular rate of pay.” The failure to do so has resulted  
5 in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period  
6 premiums, and sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members by  
7 DEFENDANTS. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid sick time  
8 for non-employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the  
9 workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee  
10 actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANTS’ conduct, as articulated herein, by  
11 failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the “regular rate of pay” for purposes of  
12 sick pay compensation was in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the underpayment of which is  
13 recoverable under Cal. Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203 and/or 204.

14 26. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the  
15 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANTS as a  
16 matter of company policy, practice and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to  
17 compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS at the correct rate  
18 of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay.  
19 This uniform policy and practice of DEFENDANTS is intended to purposefully avoid the  
20 payment of the correct overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period premiums,  
21 and sick pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANTS to illegally profit and  
22 gain an unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable  
23 tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS members against DEFENDANTS,  
24 the CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

25 **E. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

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

9         28. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and  
10 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to use their personal cell phones as a result of and in  
11 furtherance of their job duties as employees for DEFENDANT. But for the use of their own  
12 personal cell phones, PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members could not complete  
13 their essential job duties, including but not limited to, sending and receiving work-related  
14 communications from DEFENDANTS. However, DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to  
15 reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for their use of their personal  
16 cell phones. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANTS, the PLAINTIFF  
17 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred unreimbursed business expenses, but were  
18 not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cellular phones, all on behalf of and for  
19 the benefit of DEFENDANT.

20 **F. Wage Statement Violations**

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

1           30. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other  
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurate missed  
3 meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANTS also failed  
4 to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and accurate  
5 wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the total hours worked and all  
6 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time  
7 worked at each hourly rate, and correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest  
8 periods. Further, from time to time, DEFENDANTS included Paid Time Off (“PTO”) and  
9 Holiday hours into the computation of total hours worked for purposes of Cal. Lab. Code §  
10 226(a)(2), notwithstanding the fact that PTO and Holiday hours are not considered hours worked.  
11 DEFENDANTS’ inclusion of PTO and Holiday hours into the total hours worked in itemized  
12 wage statements issued to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members violates Cal.  
13 Lab. Code § 226(a)(2).

14           31. In addition to the violations described above, DEFENDANTS, from time to time,  
15 failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements  
16 that comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

21 **G. Off-the-Clock Work Resulting in Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations**

22           33. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANTS were  
23 required to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,  
24 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all  
25 the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time, DEFENDANTS required  
26 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without paying them for all the time  
27 they were under DEFENDANTS’ control. Specifically, PLAINTIFF performed work before and  
28 after the beginning of his shift, spending time under the DEFENDANTS’ control for which he was

1 not compensated. More specifically, from time to time, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA  
2 CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANTS to perform work before and after the beginning  
3 of their shifts in order to meet DEFENDANTS' prescribed labor hours to perform all the tasks  
4 required of them by DEFENDANTS. Additionally, since DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF  
5 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform as much work as possible and as quickly as  
6 possible in order to meet DEFENDANTS' strict performance and production requirements,  
7 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to work  
8 off-the-clock before and after their shifts in order to meet DEFENDANTS' strict requirements.

9         34. As a result, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited  
10 minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their time being  
11 accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates.  
12 DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
13 necessary wages for attending for performing work at DEFENDANTS' direction, request and  
14 benefit, while off-the clock. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF  
15 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANTS'  
16 business records.

17         35. DEFENDANTS directed and directly benefited from the uncompensated off-the-  
18 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

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

22         37. DEFENDANTS were able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other  
23 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANTS failed to  
24 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all  
25 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed, including pre-shift, post shift and during  
26 meal period off-the-clock work.

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

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

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

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

13 **H. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

14           42. PLAINTIFF brings the First through Eighth Causes of Action as a class action  
15 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 on behalf of all persons who are or  
16 previously were employed by Defendant Boeing Aerospace and/or Defendant Boeing Company  
17 in California and classified as non-exempt employees (“CALIFORNIA CLASS”) during the  
18 period beginning four years prior to the filing of the Complaint and ending on a date determined  
19 by the Court (“CLASS PERIOD”).

20           43. PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have uniformly been  
21 deprived of wages and penalties from unpaid wages earned and due, including but not limited to  
22 unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, unpaid meal and rest period premiums,  
23 and illegal meal and rest period policies. Defendant further failed to reimburse for business  
24 expenses, failed to compensate for off-the-clock work, failed to provide accurate itemized wage  
25 statements, and failed to maintain required records, and interest, statutory and civil penalties,  
26 attorney’s fees, costs, and expenses.

27           44. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is  
28 impractical.

1           45. Common questions of law and fact regarding DEFENDANTS' conduct, including  
2 but not limited to, the off-the-clock work, unpaid meal and rest period premiums, failing to  
3 provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to reimburse for business expenses, failure  
4 to provide accurate itemized wage statements accurate, and failure to ensure they are paid at least  
5 minimum wage and overtime, exist as to all members of the class and predominate over any  
6 questions affecting solely any individual members of the class. Among the questions of law and  
7 fact common to the class are:

- 8           i. Whether DEFENDANTS maintained legally compliant meal period policies and  
9 practices;
- 10           ii. Whether DEFENDANTS maintained legally compliant rest period policies and  
11 practices;
- 12           iii. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA  
13 CLASS Members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
- 14           iv. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA  
15 CLASS Members accurate overtime wages;
- 16           v. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA  
17 CLASS Members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
- 18           vi. Whether Defendants failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA  
19 CLASS Members for required business expenses;
- 20           vii. Whether DEFENDANTS issued legally compliant wage statements;
- 21           viii. Whether DEFENDANTS committed an act of unfair competition by  
22 systematically failing to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked;
- 24           ix. Whether DEFENDANTS committed an act of unfair competition by  
25 systematically failing to record all meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF  
26 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, even though DEFENDANTS enjoyed  
27 the benefit of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or  
28 suffers to permit this work;

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

4           46.   PLAINTIFF is a member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as  
5           a result of DEFENDANTS' conduct and actions alleged herein.

6           47.   PLAINTIFF's claims are typical of the claims of the class, and PLAINTIFF has  
7           the same interests as the other members of the class.

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

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

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

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

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

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





1           58. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to  
2 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the  
3 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code  
4 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,  
5 2802, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal.  
6 Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to  
7 constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

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

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

24           62. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unfair and  
25 deceptive in that DEFENDANT's uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide  
26 legally required meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members  
27 as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.  
28

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

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

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

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

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

25           68.     PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are further  
26 entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the described business practices are unlawful, unfair,  
27 and deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining DEFENDANT from  
28 engaging in any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.



1 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

3 76. DEFENDANT’S uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,  
4 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of  
5 implementing a uniform policy and practice that denied accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF  
6 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in regards to minimum wage pay.

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

13 78. As a direct result of DEFENDANT’S unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,  
14 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive the correct  
15 minimum wage compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANT.

16 79. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked than they were entitled to, constituting a  
18 failure to pay all earned wages.

19 80. By virtue of DEFENDANT’S unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned  
20 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the true  
21 time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have  
22 suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are presently unknown  
23 to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

24 81. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other  
25 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are under-compensated for their time worked.  
26 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross  
27 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform corporate policy, practice  
28 and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay

1 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct minimum wages  
2 for their time worked.

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

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

22 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

25 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

26 84. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and  
27 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this  
28 Complaint.

1           85.     PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim  
2 for DEFENDANT’s willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the  
3 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT’s failure to pay these employees  
4 for all overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday,  
5 and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

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

8           87.     Cal. Lab. Code § 510 further provides that employees in California shall not be  
9 employed more than eight (8) hours per workday and more than forty (40) hours per workweek  
10 unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by  
11 law.

12           88.     Cal. Lab. Code § 1194 establishes an employee’s right to recover unpaid wages,  
13 including minimum wage and overtime compensation and interest thereon, together with the costs  
14 of suit. Cal. Lab. Code § 1198 further states that the employment of an employee for longer hours  
15 than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

16           89.     During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members  
17 were required by DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time  
18 they worked, including overtime work.

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

26           91.     In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT  
27 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by  
28 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANT acted in an illegal

1 attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California  
2 Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and  
3 regulations.

4 92. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,  
5 the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive full  
6 compensation for overtime worked.

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

15 94. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been paid less for overtime worked that they are entitled to,  
17 constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

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

24 96. By virtue of DEFENDANT'S unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned  
25 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all  
26 overtime worked by these employees, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA  
27 CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are  
28 presently unknown to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.



1           97.     DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other  
2 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under compensated for all overtime worked.  
3 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross  
4 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice  
5 and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay  
6 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked.

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

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

26 ///

27 ///

28







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

3           110.   During the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA  
4 CLASS Members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurate missed meal and rest  
5 period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANTS also failed to provide  
6 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and accurate wage  
7 statements which failed to show, among other things, the total hours worked and all applicable  
8 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each  
9 hourly rate, and correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods. Further,  
10 from time to time, DEFENDANTS included Paid Time Off (“PTO”) and Holiday hours into the  
11 computation of total hours worked for purposes of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(2), notwithstanding  
12 the fact that PTO and Holiday hours are not considered hours worked. DEFENDANTS’ inclusion  
13 of PTO and Holiday hours into the total hours worked in itemized wage statements issued to  
14 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members violates Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(2). As  
15 such, the wage statements issued to PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
16 violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(2). In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANTS failed to  
17 provide itemized wage statements to PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
18 that complied with the requirements of California Labor Code Section 226.

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

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

3 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

5 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 203)**

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

7 112. 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.

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

11 As used in this article:

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

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

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

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

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

1 for purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of  
2 quitting.

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

5 117. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

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

11 118. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA CLASS Members  
12 terminated, and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of wages to these employees who were  
13 underpaid for minimum wage and/or overtime wage, and/or missed meal and rest breaks, as  
14 required by law.

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

20 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **Failure To Reimburse Employees For Required Expenses**

22 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

23 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

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

27 121. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:  
28

1 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses  
2 incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of  
3 his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the  
4 employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful

5 122. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS violated Cal.  
6 Lab. Code § 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the members of the  
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for  
8 DEFENDANTS' benefit. DEFENDANTS failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the members of  
9 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to  
10 using their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANTS.  
11 Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were required by  
12 DEFENDANTS to use their personal cell phones to execute their essential job duties on behalf of  
13 DEFENDANTS. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy, practice and procedure was to not reimburse  
14 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for expenses resulting from using  
15 their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANTS within the course and scope of their  
16 employment for DEFENDANTS. These expenses were necessary to complete their principal job  
17 duties. DEFENDANTS are estopped by DEFENDANTS' conduct to assert any waiver of their  
18 expectation. Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF and the  
19 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, DEFENDANTS failed to indemnify and reimburse  
20 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for these expenses as an employer  
21 is required to do under the laws and regulations of California.

22 123. PLAINTIFF therefore demands reimbursement on behalf of the members of the  
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS for expenditures or losses incurred in the discharge their job duties and  
24 on behalf of DEFENDANTS, or his/her obedience to the directions of DEFENDANT, with  
25 interest at the statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

26 ///

27 ///

28



**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays 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 and separately owed rest periods, due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;
- c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;
- d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for

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

violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226

e. The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.

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.

DATED: February 4, 2022

**ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

By:   
Shani O. Zakay  
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

**DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

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

DATED: February 4, 2022

**ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

By:   
Shani O. Zakay  
Attorney for PLAINTIFF