1	Rolan rguti
2	BRO 333 S
3	Los A
4	
5	Attor
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	JERI
11	beha situa
12	
13	
14	PAC
15	state.
16	and (
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

Electronically FILED by Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles 2/15/2024 1:42 PM David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court, By J. Covarrubias, Deputy Clerk

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

JEREMY MCARTHUR, individually and on behalf of all others of the public similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

PACIFIC DESIGN CENTER 1, LLC, an out-ofstate, limited liability company; PACIFIC RED, LLC, an out-of-state limited liability company; and COHEN PDC, LLC, an out-of-state limited liability company, and DOES 1 to 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

CLASS ACTION

Case No: 24STCV03908

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages [CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 1182, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197 and 1197.1; 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(4)];
- 2. Failure to Pay Overtime and Double Time Compensation [CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 510, 1194, 1198; 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(3)];
- 3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods [CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7, 512; 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(11)];
- 4. Failure to Provide Rest Periods [CAL. LAB. CODE § 226.7, CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(12)];
- 5. Failure to Indemnify [CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802; 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(9)(B)];
- 6. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements [CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226, 226.3; 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(7)]
- 7. Waiting Time Penalties [CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202, and 203]; and
- 8. Unfair Competition and Unlawful Business Practices [CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 17200, et seq.]

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMES NOW, Plaintiff JEREMY MCARTHUR ("Plaintiff"), and submits this unverified Class Action Complaint ("Complaint") as follows:

T.

INTRODUCTION

- 1. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all similarly situated individuals for (1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages; (2) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages; (3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods; (4) Failure to Provide Rest Periods; (5) Failure to Indemnity; (6) Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements; (7) Failure to Pay Earned Wages Upon Separation; and (8) Unfair Competition and Unlawful Business Practices.
- 2. All allegations in this Complaint are based upon information and belief except those allegations that pertain to the named Plaintiff and his counsel. Each allegation in this Complaint either has evidentiary support or is likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation and discovery.

II.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to section 410.10 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.
- 4. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to sections 395 and 395.5 of the California Code of Civil Procedure because the facts and circumstances giving rise to this action as alleged occurred in the County of Los Angeles.

III.

THE PARTIES

A. The Plaintiff

- 5. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, an individual:
 - (a) Residing in the County of San Bernardino, State of California;
 - (b) Who worked for Defendants, including DOES 1 through 50, as a non-exempt employee;
 - (c) Who worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and more than forty (40)

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

\overline{z}	
Õ	S
SE	\succ
Ő	ш
E &	Z
II	ĸ
VF	0
_	\vdash
\leq	\vdash
6	\forall
BRC	
60	\leq
	•

hours in a workweek, but did not receive compensation of all wages, including minimum wages, overtime, and double time compensation to which he was entitled;

- Who did not receive statutorily mandated rest or meal periods; (d)
- Who was not indemnified or reimbursed all reasonable expenses incurred for (e) the benefit of Defendants;
- (f) Who did not receive accurate itemized wage statements;
- Who was not paid all wages due upon termination; and (g)
- Who is a member of the Class as defined in paragraph 13 below. (h)

The Defendants В.

- Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, 6. that Defendant PACIFIC DESIGN CENTER 1, LLC is, and at all times herein mentioned was:
 - An out-of-state limited liability company conducting business in the County of (a) Los Angeles, State of California;
 - (b) A former and current dual employer of Plaintiff and of the Class, as defined in paragraph 13, that:
 - i. Failed to pay overtime and double time compensation for hours worked in excess of 8 hours in a workday and/or over forty hours in a workweek;
 - Failed to provide statutorily mandated rest or meal periods; ii.
 - iii. Failed to reimburse or indemnify employees for reasonable expenses;
 - Failed to provide employees with accurate itemized wage statements; iv. and
 - Failed to pay employees all wages due upon termination of their v. employment relationship.
- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendant PACIFIC, LLC is, and at all times herein mentioned was:
 - An out-of-state limited liability company conducting business in the County of (a)

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

WN WHITE & OSBORN ""	ATTORNEYS
HO, BROW	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \

Los Angeles,	α .	C	\sim 1	٠.	•
Loc Angalac	State	α t	('al-	1 tar	1110.
LUS AHECICS.	State	OI.	Cai	пог	IIIa.

- A former and current dual employer of Plaintiff and of the Class, as defined in (b) paragraph 13, that:
 - Failed to pay overtime and double time compensation for hours worked in excess of 8 hours in a workday and/or over forty hours in a workweek;
 - ii. Failed to provide statutorily mandated rest or meal periods;
 - iii. Failed to reimburse or indemnify employees for reasonable expenses;
 - iv. Failed to provide employees with accurate itemized wage statements; and
 - Failed to pay employees all wages due upon termination of their v. employment relationship.
- 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendant COHEN PDC, LLC is, and at all times herein mentioned was:
 - (a) An out-of-state limited liability company conducting business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California;
 - (b) A former and current dual employer of Plaintiff and of the Class, as defined in paragraph 31, that:
 - Failed to pay overtime and double time compensation for hours worked i. in excess of 8 hours in a workday and/or over forty hours in a workweek;
 - ii. Failed to provide statutorily mandated rest or meal periods;
 - iii. Failed to reimburse or indemnify employees for reasonable expenses;
 - iv. Failed to provide employees with accurate itemized wage statements; and
 - Failed to pay employees all wages due upon termination of their v. employment relationship.
 - 9. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, partnership, associate, or

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

otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names pursuant to section 474 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend the Complaint to allege that the Defendants named herein, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

- 10. All Defendants, including DOES 1 through 50, are "employers" as defined by the Industrial Welfare Commission because they satisfy one or more of the following three disjunctive elements: "(a) to exercise control over the wages, hours or working conditions, or (b) to suffer or permit to work, or (c) to engage, thereby creating a common law employment relationship." See Martinez v. Combs (2010) 49 Cal.4th 35, 64; see also, INDUSTRIAL WAGE ORDER No. 4, paragraph (2), subparagraphs (E), (F), and (H), (codified under 8 CAL. CODE REGS. §§ 11040(2), (E), (F), and (H)).
- 11. To the extent that any of the DOES 1 through 50 are natural persons who are an owner, director, officer, or managing agent of any of the Defendants named herein, section 558.1(a) of the California Labor Code provides that:

Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer, who violates, or causes to be violated, any provision regulating minimum wages or hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, or violates, or causes to be violated, Sections 203, 226, 226.7, 1193.6, 1194, or 2802, may be held liable as the employer for such violation.

12. All named Defendants, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive are collectively referred to herein as the "Defendants."

IV.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

13. The members of the Class consist of:

All current and former non-exempt employees who work or worked for Pacific Red, LLC, Pacific Design Center 1, LLC, and/or Cohen PDC LLC during the time-period of February 15, 2020, to the Present.

14. The persons who comprise the Class are so numerous that joinder of all such persons is impracticable, and the disposition of their claims will benefit the parties and the Court. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Class that Plaintiff seeks to represent. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class that he seeks to represent. Plaintiff does not have any

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

interests that are antagonistic to the Class that he seeks to represent. Counsel for Plaintiff is experienced, qualified, and generally able to conduct complex class action litigation.

- 15. The Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure because:
 - The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any (a) question affecting only individual members;
 - (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
 - (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the Class before the Court;
 - (d) Plaintiff and the other Class members will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless this action is maintained as a class action;
 - There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable (e) relief for the legal and statutory violations and other improprieties and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries that Defendant's actions have inflicted upon the Class;
 - (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets and available insurance of Defendants are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the Class for injuries sustained;
 - (g) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Class for the injuries sustained; would create a risk of (i) inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants, and/or (2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members of the Class which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members not parties to the adjudications or would substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, due to factors including but not limited to the potential exhaustion of funds available from the parties who are,

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

or may be, responsible for compensation;

(h) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to the Class as a whole.

V.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 16. Within four years preceding the initiation of this Action and ongoing, Plaintiff and members of the Class were and/or are currently employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees.
- 17. Defendants own and/or operate a 1.6 million square-foot, multi-use facility in West Hollywood, California, that operates as a hub for professionals in interior design and the architecture industry, which is a key destination for the design community and the general public to view exhibitions, lectures, and meetings related to the arts.
- While job classifications and duties may vary among non-exempt employees, such as 18. "engineers"; security; janitors; and in-house restaurant, café, and fitness center staff members, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' policies, procedures, and/or practices were uniformly enforced against all non-exempt employees.
- 19. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that it is Defendants' common policy, procedure, and/or business practice to require all non-exempt employees, irrespective of job classification or job duties, to work during their meal and rest breaks. It is also Defendants' common policy, practice, and/or procedure to require on-duty meal breaks in the absence of an on-duty meal break agreements.
- 20. Plaintiff further alleged that Defendants has a policy, procedure, and/or practice to require non-exempt employees to carry a radio at all times, and thus, they are never relieved of their respective duties during breaks.
- 21. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that Defendants required him and members of the Class to work shifts exceeding eight (8) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week but failed to compensate them with overtime and/or double-time compensation for all time worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or forty (40) hours in

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

5

BROWN WHITE & OSBORN W

any given workweek.

- 22. In addition, for each occurrence of these rest and meal period violations, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and members of the Class an hour premium payment at their regular rate of pay.
- Plaintiff also informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that it was and is 23. Defendants' common policy and practice to require its employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Class, to use their own tools and equipment. Defendants, however, failed to reimburse or indemnify Plaintiffs or members of the Class for using their personal property for the benefit of Defendants' business operations.
- 24. Due to Defendants' failure to properly pay its employees for all hours worked, including overtime compensation, double time compensation, and meal and rest break premiums, as a derivative result Plaintiff and members of the Class were not provided with accurate itemized wage statements, nor were they paid all wages due upon termination.
- 25. In addition, because Plaintiff and members of the Class were not compensated for all hours worked, their paychecks did not, and do not, accurately or correctly reflect all hours worked or the corresponding rates of pay.

VI.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

[CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 1182, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1197.1; 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(4)] (By Plaintiff and Putative Class as Against all Defendants, including DOES 1 through 50)

- 26. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates herein each and every allegation contained in each of the preceding paragraphs in this Complaint as fully set forth herein by reference.
- 27. California law requires the state minimum wage to be at least equal to the federal minimum wage. CAL. LAB. CODE § 1182(b).
- 28. Notwithstanding section 1182(b) of the California Labor Code, the minimum wage may be fixed by applicable state or local law and the payment of a lower wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. CAL. LAB. CODE § 1197.
 - On April 4, 2016, Govern Jerry Brown signed into legislation Senate Bill 3 "SB 3" 29.

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

adopting a six-step increase to the state minimum wage. Relevant here,

For any employer who employees 26 or more employees, and minimum wage shall be as follows: [¶]

- (D) From January 1, 2020, to December 31, 2020, inclusive, thirteen dollars (\$13) per hour. [¶]
- (E) From January 1, 2021, to December 31, 2021, inclusive,-fourteen dollars (\$14) per
- (F) From January 1, 2022, and until adjusted by subdivision (c)-fifteen dollars (\$15) per
- CAL. LAB. CODE § 1182.12(b)(1)(D)-(F), et. seq.; see also, 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(4)(A)(2).
- 30. One of the protections outlined SB 3 involves an annual review of the United States Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (U.S. CPI-W) by the Department of Finance. CAL. LAB. CODE § 1182.12(d), et seq.
- 31. In July 2022, the Department of Finance found that the inflation rate had increased by 7.9%, which required an increase in the minimum wage by 3.5%, resulting in the \$15.50 minimum hourly rate effective January 1, 2023. 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(4)(A)(1)(b).
- 32. In July 2023, the Department of Finance found that the inflation rate had increased by 6.16% percent for the period from July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023, compared to the prior 12-month period, which required an increase in the minimum wage by 3.5%, resulting in the \$16.00 minimum hourly rate effective January 1, 2024. 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(4)(A)(1)(a).
- 33. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that from February 15, 2020, and ongoing, Defendants, including DOES 1 through 50, both individually and in the aggregate, employed 26 or more employees, including Plaintiffs and members of the Class.
- Plaintiffs and members of the Class were not compensated for all hours worked, as 34. alleged herein. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay Plaintiffs or members of the Class their respective and applicable minimum wages, Plaintiffs and members of the Class have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown, but which exceed the jurisdictional limits of this Court, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.
 - 35. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay Plaintiffs and members of the Class

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

their respective and applicable minimum wages, Plaintiffs and members of the Class are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of the full amounts of minimum wages as applicable, including interest thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit. CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 218.5 and 1194.

36. In addition, Plaintiffs and members of the Class are "entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon." CAL. LAB. CODE § 1194.2.

VII.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Pay Overtime Wages and Double Time Compensation [CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 510, 1194, 1198; 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(3)] (By Plaintiff and Putative Class as Against all Defendants, including DOES 1 through 50)

- 37. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates herein each and every allegation contained in each of the preceding paragraphs in this Complaint as fully set forth herein by reference.
- 38. CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 and INDUSTRIAL WAGE ORDER No. 4-2001(3)(A)(1)(a), which is codified under 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(3)(A)(1)(a), as amended, provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or more than forty (40) hours in any workweek, unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. In addition, an employer must pay double the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in any workday, and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh (7th) consecutive day of work in a workweek. 8 CAL. LAB. CODE § 11040(3)(A)(1)(b).
- 39. CAL. LAB. CODE § 1194 provides that an employee who has not been paid overtime compensation as required by section 1198 may recover the unpaid balance of the full amount of such overtime compensation, together with costs of suit, penalties, interest thereon, and attorneys' fees in a civil action.
- 40. Plaintiffs and members of the Class were not compensated for all hours worked. As a result, Plaintiff and members of the Class worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek as non-exempt employees of Defendants, including DOES 1

6

3

9

12

BROWN WHITE & OSBORN W

through 50, without receiving overtime or double time compensation.

- At all times relevant hereto, Defendants, including DOES 1 through 50, failed to pay 41. Plaintiff or members of the Class overtime and double time compensation for the hours he worked in excess of the maximum hours permissible by law as required by 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040 and CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 510, 1194, and 1198.
- 42. At no time relevant hereto were Plaintiff or members of the Class exempt from any wage and hour provision under California law, including without limitation, any statute, rule, or regulation governing the payment of overtime compensation.
- 43. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to the Plaintiff and the Class for their overtime hours, they have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in the form of unpaid overtime and double time compensation subject to proof.
- 44. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to seek and recover interest at a rate of 10%, and reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 128.5, 218.6, 1194, CAL. CODE CIV. PROC. § 1032, and CAL. CIVIL CODE § 3289, et. seq.

VIII.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

[CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7, 512; 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(11)]

(By Plaintiff and the Putative Class Against All Defendants, Including DOES 1 through 50)

- 45. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates herein each and every allegation contained in each of the preceding paragraphs in this Complaint as fully set forth herein by reference.
- 46. CAL. LAB. CODE § 512(a) provides that no employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without providing a meal period of not less than 30 minutes. An employee who works no more than six (6) hours may waive the meal period by mutual consent.
- 47. INDUSTRIAL WAGE ORDER No. 4-2001 (11)(A), which is codified under 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(10)(A), states that an employer must relieve the employee of all work-related duties during meal breaks; otherwise, the employee will be considered to be "on duty," which constitutes compensable time.

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

- 48. In addition, CAL. LAB. CODE § 226.7 provides, in relevant part, as follows:
- (b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal... period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission....

- (c) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal... period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission[]..., the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal... period is not provided.
- For every instance where an employer fails to provide an employee with an 49. uninterrupted meal period in accordance with INDUSTRIAL WAGE ORDER No. 4(11)(A), the employer shall pay the employee one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided. 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(11)(B); see also, CAL. LAB. CODE § 226.7(c).
- 50. At all relevant times hereto, Plaintiff and members of the Class regularly worked more than five-hour increments; however, at all times relevant hereto, Defendants, including DOES 1 through 50, failed to provide uninterrupted meal periods to Plaintiff and members of the Class as required by CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7, 512 and 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(11), as further alleged herein.
- 51. By virtue of requiring Plaintiff and the Class to work through meal periods free form work duties, Defendants have intentionally and improperly denied statutorily mandated meal periods in violation of CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7, 512, and 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(11). Plaintiff and the Class have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in the form of unpaid meal break premium payments in an amount according to proof, along with interest pursuant to section 3287 of the California Civil Code.
- 52. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to seek and recover interest at a rate of 7% pursuant to CAL. CONST., ART. XV, § 1, and costs pursuant to CAL. CIVIL CODE § 1032, et. seq.

///

28 ///

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

51	
الا سالا	13
HZ.	
	14
M C	15
SOWIT A T	16
	17
\lesssim	18
<i></i>	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24

25

26

27

28

IX.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Provide Rest Periods

[CAL. LAB. CODE § 226.7; 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(12)]

(By Plaintiff and the Putative Class Against All Defendants, Including DOES 1 through 50)

- 53. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates herein each and every allegation contained in each of the preceding paragraphs in this Complaint as fully set forth herein by reference.
 - 54. CAL. LAB. CODE § 226.7 provides in relevant part, as follows:
 - (b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during a... rest... period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission....

- (d) A rest... period mandated pursuant to a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission[]..., shall be counted as hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.
- 55. The California Labor Code also states, in relevant part:

If an employer fails to provide an employee a... rest... period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission[]..., the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the... rest... period is not provided.

CAL. LAB. CODE § 227.7(c).

- 56. INDUSTRIAL WAGE ORDER No. 4-2001 (12)(A), which is codified under 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(12)(A), requires employers to provide rest breaks that shall be counted as hours worked for which there shall be no deduction of wages.
- 57. 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(12)(A), also requires that an employer provide its employees with a 10-minute rest break for every four-hour increment of time worked, or major fraction thereof. See also, Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (2012) 53 Cal. 4th 1004, 1029 ("Employees are entitled to 10 minute rests for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on.").
 - 58. CAL. LAB. CODE § 226.7 and 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(12)(B), further require that

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

for every workday in which it fails to provide a rest period during any four-hour increment, the employer must pay the employee premium wages at a rate of an hour's pay at the employee's regular rate of pay.

- 59. Plaintiff and members of the Class regularly worked four-hour increments and were not provided with statutorily mandated rest breaks during their shifts.
- 60. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to authorize, permit, and provide rest periods as required by law, Plaintiff and members of the Class have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in the form of unpaid rest break premium payments in an amount according to proof, along with interest pursuant to section 3287 of the California Civil Code.
- 61. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to seek and recover interest at a rate of 7% pursuant to CAL. CONST., ART. XV, § 1, and costs pursuant to CAL. CIVIL CODE § 1032, et seq.

X.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Indemnify

[CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802; 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(9)(B)]

(By Plaintiff and the Putative Class Against All Defendants, Including DOES 1 through 50)

- 62. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates herein each and every allegation contained in each of the preceding paragraphs in this Complaint as fully set forth herein by reference.
- 63. INDUSTRIAL WAGE ORDER No. 4-2001, which is codified under 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040, as amended, states in relevant part: "[w]hen tools or equipment or are necessary for the performance of a job, such tools and equipment shall be provided and maintained by the employer...." 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(9)(B).
- 64. Section 2802(a) of the California Labor Code provides that "[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer...."

65. In addition:

All awards made by a court or by the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement for reimbursement of necessary expenditures under this section shall carry interest at the

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

NZ N	
8	S
S	>
ر پ	ш
HITE &	Z
	~
Ξ	0
>	⊢
SROWN	⊢
5	<
×	
Σ	
0	2
	2
1)
4	

same rate as judgments in civil actions. Interest shall accrue from the date on which the employee incurred the necessary expenditure or loss.

Id. § 2802(b). Under this section the term "necessary expenditures or losses" includes attorneys' fees. *Id.* § 2802(c).

- 66. It was and is Defendants' common policy and practice to require its employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Class, to use their own tools and equipment. Plaintiff and members of the Class, however, were never reimbursed for the use of their personal tools or equipment, which were used for the benefit of the Defendants herein.
- 67. As a proximate result of Defendants' unlawful actions and omissions, Plaintiff and the Class have been damaged in an amount according to proof at trial, and they seek reimbursement of all necessary expenditures, plus interest thereon at a rate of 10% pursuant to section 2802(b) of the California Labor Code.
- 68. Additionally, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to an award of costs, expenses, and reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802(c) and CAL. CIV. CODE § 1032, et seq.

XI.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements

[CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226, 226.3; 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(7)]

(By Plaintiff and the Putative Class Against All Defendants, Including DOES 1 through 50)

- 69. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates herein each and every allegation contained in each of the preceding paragraphs in this Complaint as fully set forth herein by reference.
- 70. CAL. LAB. CODE § 226 provides that an employer shall provide its employees with accurate wage statements as follows:
 - (a) Every employer shall, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, furnish each of his or her employees, either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately when wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee...[,] (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity 1 that is the employer...[,] and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay 2 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee and, beginning July 1, 2013, if the employer is a temporary services employer as defined in Section 201.3, the rate of pay and the total hours worked for 3 each temporary services assignment At all times relevant hereto, the fundamental, formally established public policy of the State of California as expressed in Article I, section 8 of the California Constitution was and is that employees be free from race-4 5 based and disability-based discrimination and harassment in their employment. 71. INDUSTRIAL WAGE ORDER No. 4-2001, which is codified under 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 6 7 11040, as amended, states in relevant part:

- - (B) Every employer who has control over wages, hours, or working conditions shall semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages furnish each employee an itemized statement in writing showing: (1) all deductions; (2) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; (3) the name of the employee or the employee's social security number; and (4) the name of the employer, provided all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item. [¶]
 - (C) All required records shall be in the English language and in ink or other indelible form, dated properly, showing month, day and year. The employer who has control over wages, hours, or working conditions shall also keep said records on file at the place of employment or at a central location for at least three years. An employee's records shall be available for inspection by the employee upon reasonable request.

8 CAL. CODE REGS. §§ 11040(7), (B)-(C).

- 72. At all times relevant herein, Defendants, including DOES 1 through 50, failed to properly and accurately itemize the number of hours worked by Plaintiff and the Class at their effective regular rates of pay, including the effective overtime rates of pay. The wage statements also failed to identify the correct or true employers of Plaintiff or the Class.
- 73. By failing to pay Plaintiffs and members of the Class wages for all hours worked, including overtime compensation, Defendants have violated the requirement that the total hours worked, and all wages earned be included in the wage statements that must be provided to the Plaintiff and the Class.
- 74. Defendants willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to comply with CAL. LAB. CODE § 226 by failing to pay minimum wages, overtime compensation for hours worked in excess of forty, and by failing to provide meal breaks or paying the appropriate premium wages for missed meal breaks, as required by law, thereby causing damages to Plaintiff and the Class by failing to include all hours worked and wages earned in their wage statements. These damages include and are not limited

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

to costs expended calculating the true hours worked and the amount of employment taxes that were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities, are difficult to estimate. Therefore, Plaintiff elects to recover penalties on behalf of themselves and on behalf of the Class pursuant to CAL. LAB. CODE § 226 in an amount \$4,000 each, and reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to CAL. LAB. CODE § 226(g) and CAL. CODE CIV. PROC. § 1032, et. seq.

XII.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Waiting Time Penalties

[Cal. Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203]

(By Plaintiff and the Putative Class Against All Defendants, Including DOES 1 through 50)

- 75. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates herein each and every allegation contained in each of the preceding paragraphs in this Complaint as fully set forth herein by reference.
- 76. Sections 201 and 202 of the California Labor Code require employers to pay their employees all wages due immediately upon discharge, or within seventy-two hours of resigning without notice.
- 77. Section 203 of the California Labor Code provides that when an employer willfully fails to make a timely payment of final wages pursuant to sections 201 and 202 of the California Labor Code, the employer must, as a penalty, continue to pay the employee's wages at an employee's daily rate, up to thirty days.
- Defendants, including DOES 1 through 50, willfully, knowingly, and intentionally 78. failed to fully compensate all wages due to Plaintiff and the Class, including minimum wages, overtime, double time, and meal and rest break premiums, as further alleged herein.
- 79. Since Plaintiff and the members of the Class have yet to be fully compensated for all hours worked, they are entitled to waiting time penalties in the amount of their daily rate of pay up to thirty days pursuant to section 203 of the California Labor Code, in an amount according to proof,
- 80. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to seek and recover interest at a rate of 10%, and costs pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 218.6, Cal. Civil Code § 3289, and Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1032, et seg.

XIII.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Unfair Competition and Unlawful Business Practices

[CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 17200, et seq.]

(By Plaintiff and the Putative Class Against All Defendants, Including DOES 1 through 50)

- 81. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates herein each and every allegation contained in each of the preceding paragraphs in this Complaint as fully set forth herein by reference.
- 82. Each Defendant named herein is considered a "person," as the term is defined under CAL. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17021.
- 83. CAL. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 defines unfair competition as any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice.
- 84. Plaintiff and the members of the Class have suffered an injury-in-fact as a result of Defendants' conduct in violation of the Unfair Competition Law (CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 17200 et. seq.). Specifically, Plaintiff and the Class have lost money and/or property as a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct. The injuries suffered by Plaintiff and the Class were directly related to Defendants' wrongful conduct.
- 85. At all times relevant hereto, by and through the conduct described herein, Defendants, including DOES 1 through 50, have engaged in unfair, fraudulent and unlawful practices, in violation of CAL. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 et. seq., and have thereby deprived Plaintiff and members of the Class of fundamental rights and privileges guaranteed to all employees under the California Labor Code.
- 86. All of the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, are unlawful and in violation of public policy, and are immoral, unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous, and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent business practices in violation of CAL. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 et seq. Specifically, Defendants' unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent business practices include the following violations:
 - (a) Failure to timely pay wages at the appropriate rate of pay, including minimum wages, in violation of CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 204, 510, 511, 558, 1182.12, 1194,

	1197, 1198, and 8 CAL. CODE R	REGS. §§ 11040(4)), <i>et seg.</i> , and 110	40(3), et seg.
--	-------------------------------	-------------------	-----------------------------	----------------

- (b) Failure to provide meal periods as mandated by CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 and 512, and 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(11), et seq.;
- (c) Failure to provide rest periods as mandated by CAL. LAB. CODE § 226.7, and 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(12), et seq.;
- (d) Failure to provide prompt payment of wages to employees upon termination and resignation in violation of CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202, and 203;
- (e) Failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements to employees in violation of CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226 and 226.3; and
- (f) Failure to indemnify or reimburse for all out-of-pocket expenses in violation of CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802, and 8 CAL. CODE REGS. § 11040(9)(B).
- 87. By and through the unfair, fraudulent, and unlawful business practices described herein, Defendants, including DOES 1 through 50, have obtained valuable property, money, and services from Plaintiffs and the Class, and has deprived them of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by the law, all to their detriment.
- 88. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that Defendants have underreported to federal and state authorities the wages earned by Plaintiff and the members of the Class, and therefore, have underpaid state and federal taxes, employer matching funds, unemployment premiums, Social Security, Medicare and Workers' Compensation premiums. This conduct is criminal in nature and subjects Defendants to sanctions, fines, and imprisonment, and is actionable under CAL. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 1700, et seq. and 17200 et seq.
- 89. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that by requiring Plaintiff and the Class to work without minimum wage compensation, or work overtime without receiving overtime compensation, and failing to provide meal and rest periods, Defendants have engaged in business within the state of California to offer its services at a lower price for the purpose of injuring competitors and/or destroying competition in violation of CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 17043.
 - 90. Pursuant to CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17071 and 17075, Defendants' failure to pay

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

wages, overtime compensation, related benefits, and employment taxes, is admissible as evidence of Defendants' intent to violate Chapter 4 of the Unfair Business Trade Act.

- 91. Defendants' practices are unlawful, unfair, deceptive, untrue, and misleading.
- 92. Plaintiff is entitled to seek, and does seek, such relief as may be necessary to restore the money and property that Defendants have acquired, or of which Plaintiff and members of the Class have been deprived of, by means of the above-described unfair and unlawful business practices.
- 93. Plaintiff and the Class have no plain, speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries that they have suffered as a consequence of Defendants' unfair and unlawful business practices. As such, Defendants should be required to disgorge the unpaid moneys owed to Plaintiff and the Class.
- 94. Because Plaintiff seeks to enforce an important right affecting the public interest, to wit, the lawful payment of wages as required by law, the disgorgement of ill-gotten gains, and the restitution of unlawfully withheld wages, with interest thereon at a rate of 10% pursuant to CAL. LAB. CODE § 218.6, and CAL. CIVIL CODE § 3289, Plaintiff requests an award of attorneys' fees, pursuant to CAL. CODE CIV. PROC. § 1021.5, and costs pursuant to CAL. CODE CIV. PROC. § 1032.

XIV.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against each of Defendants as follows:

On The First Cause of Action. A.

- 1. For compensatory damages, including unpaid wages, and other losses in an amount according to proof;
 - 2. For liquidated damages pursuant to CAL. LAB. CODE § 1194.2;
- 3. For an award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate pursuant to
- CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 218.6, 1194, and CAL. CIV. CODE § 3289, et seq.; and
- For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit pursuant to CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 218.5, 1194, and CAL.
- 26 CODE CIV. PROC. § 1032.

В. On The Second Cause of Action.

4. For compensatory damages, including lost wages, in an amount in an amount according

to	proof;
w	proor,

- 5. For an award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the rate of 10% CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 218.6, 1194, and CAL. CIV. CODE § 3289, et seq.; and
- 6. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit pursuant to CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 218.5, 1194, and CAL. CODE CIV. PROC. § 1032.

C. On the Third and Fourth Causes of Actions.

- 7. For unpaid premium payments in an amount according to proof;
- 8. For an award of interest, including prejudgment interest, at a rate of 7% pursuant to CAL. CONST., ART. XV, § 1; and
 - 9. For reasonable costs of suit pursuant to CAL. CODE CIV. PROC. § 1032.

D. On the Fifth Cause of Action.

- 10. For reimbursement of all necessary expenditures, plus interest thereon at a rate of 10%, pursuant to CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802(b); and
- 11. For costs and attorneys' fees pursuant to CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802(c) and CAL. CIV. CODE § 1032, et seq.

E. On the Sixth Cause of Action.

- 12. For statutory penalties pursuant to CAL. LAB. CODE § 226; and
- 13. For attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to CAL. LAB. CODE § 226(g) and CAL. CODE CIV. PROC. § 1032, et seq.

F. On the Seventh Cause of Action.

- 14. For statutory penalties CAL. LAB. CODE § 203, plus interest thereon at a rate of 10%, pursuant to CAL. LAB. CODE § 218.6 and CAL. CIVIL CODE § 3289;
 - 15. For costs of suit pursuant to CAL. CODE CIV. PROC. § 1032.

G. On the Eighth Cause of Action.

16. That Defendants, including DOES 1 through 50, be ordered and enjoined to pay restitution and penalties to Plaintiffs due to Defendants' unlawful and/or unfair activities, pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17200-05, plus interest thereon at a rate of 10%, pursuant to CAL. LAB. CODE § 218.6 and CAL. CIVIL CODE § 3289;

1	17.	That Defendants, including DOES 1 through 50, further be enjoined to cease and desist
2	from unlawfu	al and/or unfair activities in violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.;
3	18.	For costs of suit pursuant to CAL. CODE CIV. PROC. § 1032; and
4	19.	For attorneys' fees pursuant to CAL. CODE CIV. PROC. § 1021.5.
5	H. On A	ll Causes of Action.
6	20.	For an order granting class certification
7	21.	For costs of suit pursuant to CAL. CODE CIV. PROC. § 1032; and
8	22.	For other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper
9		XV.
10		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
11	Plaint	iff requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.
12		
13	Dated: Februa	Brown White & Osborn LLP
14		Deliveto Falan 1
15		By: ROLANDO J. GUTIERREZ
16		Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Class
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		21