

ENDORSED
FILED
ALAMEDA COUNTY

JUL 17 2019

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
By JAMIE THOMAS, Deputy

1 Scott Edward Cole, Esq. (S.B. #160744)
2 Andrew Daniel Weaver, Esq. (S.B. #318935)
3 **SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC**
4 555 12th Street, Suite 1725
5 Oakland, California 94607
6 Telephone: (510) 891-9800
7 Facsimile: (510) 891-7030
8 Email: scole@scalaw.com
9 Email: aweaver@scalaw.com
10 Web: www.scalaw.com

11 Attorneys for Representative Plaintiff
12 And the Plaintiff Class

13 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
14 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA**

15 NICHOLAS FORSYTHE, on behalf of
16 himself and all other similarly situated,

17 Plaintiff,

18 vs.

19 CAPITOL VALLEY ELECTRIC, INC.
20 and DOES 1-100, inclusive,

21 Defendants.

Case No. **RG19027298**

CLASS/COLLECTIVE ACTION

**COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES,
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND RESTITUTION**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12th STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

22 Representative Plaintiff alleges as follows:

23 **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

24 1. This is a class action seeking unpaid compensation for meal and/or rest period
25 violations, interest thereon, reimbursement of business expenses, liquidated damages and other
26 penalties, injunctive and other equitable relief, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under,
27 *inter alia*, California Labor Code §§ 200-204, inclusive, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5,
28 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* and
California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5. Plaintiff Nicholas Forsythe ("Representative
Plaintiff" or "Plaintiff") was employed by Capitol Valley Electric, Inc. ("Defendant") in
California. At all times during the relevant period, Plaintiff was employed as a non-exempt

1 electrician—installing and maintaining electrical systems for Defendant’s customers. Plaintiff
2 brings this lawsuit on behalf of himself and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated who
3 have been employed by Defendant as non-exempt electricians in the State of California within
4 the applicable class period.

5 2. The class period is designated as July 16, 2015 through trial, based upon the
6 allegation that the violations of California’s wage and hour laws, as described more fully below,
7 have been ongoing throughout that time.

8 3. During the class period, Defendant had a consistent policy of (1) failing to pay
9 Plaintiff and Class Members for all hours worked, (2) permitting, encouraging and/or requiring
10 Plaintiff and Class Members to work in excess of eight hours per day and/or in excess of forty
11 hours per week without paying them overtime compensation as required by California’s wage
12 and hour laws, (3) unlawfully denying Plaintiff and Class Members statutorily-mandated meal
13 and rest periods, and (4) willfully failing to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate
14 semimonthly itemized wage statements reflecting the total number of hours each worked, the
15 applicable deductions, and the applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period. In
16 addition, Plaintiff is informed and believes and, on that basis, alleges that Defendant had a
17 consistent policy of willfully failing to pay compensation (including unpaid overtime) in a
18 prompt and timely manner to Plaintiff and Class Members whose employment has ended.

19
20 **INTRODUCTION**

21 4. Defendant operates an electrical contracting company within California for which
22 Representative Plaintiff worked as a non-exempt electrician. Representative Plaintiff is informed
23 and believes and, on that basis, allege that, within the Class Period, Defendant employed
24 hundreds of individuals as non-exempt electricians, employment positions which did not, and
25 currently do not, meet any known test for exemption from the payment of overtime wages and/or
26 the entitlement to meal or rest periods.

27 5. Despite actual knowledge of these facts and legal mandates, Defendant has and
28 continues to enjoy an advantage over its competition and a resultant disadvantage to its workers

1 by electing not to pay all wages due (including off the clock, overtime and missed meal and rest
2 period compensation) and/or all penalties dues (including “waiting time” penalties) to its
3 restaurant workers.

4 6. Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, based thereon, alleges that
5 Defendant knew of these facts and legal mandates yet, nonetheless, repeatedly authorized and/or
6 ratified the violation of the laws cited herein.

7 7. Despite Defendant’s knowledge of Class Members’ entitlement to overtime pay
8 and meal and/or rest periods for all applicable work periods, Defendant failed to provide same to
9 the Class Members, in violation of California state statutes, the applicable California Industrial
10 Welfare Commission Wage Order, and Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations. This action
11 is brought to redress and end this prolonged pattern of unlawful conduct once and for all.

12
13 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

14 8. This Court has jurisdiction over the Representative Plaintiff’s and Class
15 Members’ claims for unpaid wages, expenses and/or penalties under, *inter alia*, the applicable
16 Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order, Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations,
17 various sections of the California Labor Code, and/or the California Code of Civil Procedure §
18 1021.5.

19 9. This Court also has jurisdiction over the Representative Plaintiff’s and Class
20 Members’ claims for injunctive relief and restitution of ill-gotten benefits arising from
21 Defendant’s unfair and/or fraudulent business practices under California Business & Professions
22 Code § 17200, *et seq.*

23 10. Venue as to Defendant is proper in this judicial district pursuant to California
24 Code of Civil Procedure § 395(a). Defendant provides electrical contracting services within the
25 County of Alameda (where Plaintiff and numerous Class Members worked), transacts business,
26 has agents, and is otherwise within this Court’s jurisdiction for purposes of service of process.
27 The unlawful acts alleged herein have and have had a direct effect on Representative Plaintiff
28 and those similarly situated within the State of California and within the County of Alameda.

1 **PLAINTIFF(S)**

2 11. Representative Plaintiff Nicholas Forsythe is a resident of the State of California,
3 is a natural person, and was employed by Defendant Capitol Valley Electric, Inc. and Does 1
4 through 100 ("Defendant"). Representative Plaintiff was categorized by Defendant as a non-
5 exempt electrician during the relevant time period.

6
7 **DEFENDANT(S)**

8 12. Defendant Capitol Valley Electric, Inc. is engaged in business in the State of
9 California, County of Alameda.

10 13. Those defendants identified as Does 1 through 100, inclusive, are and were, at all
11 relevant times herein-mentioned, officers, directors, partners, and/or managing agents of some or
12 each of the remaining defendants. Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, on that
13 basis, alleges that at all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendant Capitol Valley Electric, Inc.,
14 and those identified as Does 1 through 100, inclusive, employed, and/or exercised control over
15 the wages, hours, and/or working conditions of Plaintiff within the State of California.

16 14. Representative Plaintiff is unaware of the true names and capacities of those
17 defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 100, inclusive and, therefore, sues these defendants by
18 such fictitious names. Representative Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint
19 when such names are ascertained. Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, on that
20 basis, alleges that each of the fictitiously-named defendants was responsible in some manner for,
21 gave consent to, ratified, and/or authorized the conduct herein alleged and that Representative
22 Plaintiff's and Class Members' damages, as herein alleged, were proximately caused thereby.

23 15. Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, on that basis, alleges that, at
24 all relevant times herein mentioned, each of the defendants was the agent and/or employee of
25 each of the remaining defendants and, in doing the acts herein alleged, was acting within the
26 course and scope of such agency and/or employment.

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12th STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL. (510) 891-9800

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

1
2 16. The Representative Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and as a class
3 action on behalf of all persons similarly situated and proximately damaged by Defendant's
4 conduct including, but not necessarily limited to, the following Plaintiff Class:

5
6 All persons employed as non-exempt electricians by Capitol
7 Valley Electric, Inc., in California at any time on or after July 16,
8 2015.

9 17. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action
10 under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because there is a well-defined community of
11 interest in the litigation and the proposed Class is easily ascertainable.

12 a. Numerosity: A class action is the only available method for the fair
13 and efficient adjudication of this controversy. The members of the
14 Plaintiff Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is
15 impractical, if not impossible, insofar as Representative Plaintiff is
16 informed and believes and, on that basis, alleges that there are
17 sufficient Class Members to meet the numerosity requirement.
18 Membership in the Class will be determined upon analysis of
19 employee and payroll, among other, records maintained by
20 Defendant.

21 b. Commonality: The Representative Plaintiff and the Class Members
22 share a community of interests in that there are numerous common
23 questions and issues of fact and law which predominate over any
24 questions and issues solely affecting individual members,
25 including, but not necessarily limited to:

- 26 1) Whether Defendant violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7
27 and/or 512 by failing to consistently provide duty-free meal
28 periods and/or rest periods to its non-exempt electricians;
- 29 2) Whether Defendant violated California Labor Code § 1194 by
30 failing to pay no less than the legal minimum wage for all
31 hours worked to its non-exempt electricians;
- 32 3) Whether Defendant violated California Business and
33 Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* by engaging in unfair,
34 unlawful, and/or fraudulent business practices;
- 35 4) Whether Defendant violated California Labor Code § 1174 by
36 failing to keep accurate records of employees' hours of work;
- 37 5) Whether Defendant violated California Labor Code §§ 201-
38 204 by failing to pay wages due and owing at the time that
39 Plaintiff's and certain Class Members' employment with
40 Defendant terminated;

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12th STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

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

- 6) Whether Defendant violated California Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide semimonthly itemized statements to Class Members of total hours worked by each and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period; and
 - 7) Whether Class Members are entitled to “waiting time” penalties, pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.
- c. Typicality: The Representative Plaintiff’s claims are typical of the claims of Class Members. The Representative Plaintiff and Class Members sustained damages arising out of and caused by Defendant’s common course of conduct in violation of law, as alleged herein.
 - d. Adequacy of Representation: The Representative Plaintiff in this class action is an adequate representative of the Plaintiff Class in that the Representative Plaintiff’s claims are typical of those of the Plaintiff Class and the Representative Plaintiff has the same interest in the litigation of this case as the Class Members. The Representative Plaintiff is committed to vigorous prosecution of this case and has retained competent counsel who are experienced in conducting litigation of this nature. The Representative Plaintiff is not subject to any individual defenses unique from those conceivably applicable to Class Members as a whole. The Representative Plaintiff anticipates no management difficulties in this litigation.
 - e. Superiority of Class Action: Since the damages suffered by individual Class Members, while not inconsequential, may be relatively small, the expense and burden of individual litigation by each member makes or may make it impractical for Class Members to seek redress individually for the wrongful conduct alleged herein. Should separate actions be brought, or be required to be brought, by each individual Class Member, the resulting multiplicity of lawsuits would cause undue hardship and expense for the Court and the litigants. The prosecution of separate actions would also create a risk of inconsistent rulings which might be dispositive of the interests of other Class Members who are not parties to the adjudications and/or may substantially impede their ability to adequately protect their interests.

COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

18. As described herein, for years, Defendant has knowingly failed to adequately compensate those employees within the class definition identified above for all wages earned (including pay for employer mandated travel after the first location the employee’s presence was required and premium wages such as compensation for missed meal and/or rest periods) under

1 the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Order, thereby enjoying a significant
2 competitive edge over other service providers.

3 19. Defendant has declined to pay these wages, even upon a Class Member's
4 termination or resignation from employment, in blatant violation of California Labor Code § 201
5 and/or § 202.

6 20. California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 require Defendant to pay severed
7 employees all wages due and owed to the employee immediately upon discharge or within 72
8 hours of resignation of their positions, in most circumstances. California Labor Code § 203
9 provides that an employer who willfully fails to timely pay such wages must, as a penalty,
10 continue to pay the subject employees' wages until the back wages are paid in full or an action is
11 commenced, and the payment of such penalty shall continue for a period of time up to 30 days.

12 21. Furthermore, despite its knowledge of the Representative Plaintiff's and the Class
13 Members' entitlement to compensation for all hours worked, Defendant violated California
14 Labor Code § 1174(d) by failing to provide or require the use, maintenance, or submission of
15 time records by members of the Plaintiff Class. Defendant also failed to provide the
16 Representative Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate semimonthly itemized statements of
17 the total number of hours worked by each, and all applicable hourly rates in effect, during the
18 pay period, in violation of California Labor Code § 226. In failing to provide the required
19 documents, Defendant has not only failed to pay its workers the full amount of compensation due
20 but the company has also, until now, effectively shielded itself from its employees' scrutiny by
21 concealing the magnitude and financial impact of its wrongdoing that such documents might
22 otherwise have led workers to discover.

23 22. Representative Plaintiff and all persons similarly situated are entitled to unpaid
24 compensation, yet, to date, have not received such compensation despite many of the same
25 having been terminated by and/or resigned from Defendant's employ. More than 30 days have
26 passed since certain Class Members have left Defendant's employ.

27 23. As a consequence of Defendant's willful conduct in not paying former employees
28 compensation for all hours worked in a prompt and timely manner, certain Class Members are

1 entitled to up to 30 days wages as a penalty under California Labor Code § 203, together with
2 attorneys' fees and costs.

3 24. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, as set forth
4 herein, Representative Plaintiff and Class Members have sustained damages, as described above,
5 including compensation for loss of earnings for hours worked on behalf of Defendant, in an
6 amount to be established at trial. As a further direct and proximate result of Defendant's
7 unlawful conduct, as set forth herein, certain Class Members are entitled to recover "waiting
8 time" penalties (pursuant to California Labor Code § 203) and penalties for failure to provide
9 semimonthly statements of hours worked and all applicable hourly rates (pursuant to California
10 Labor Code § 226) in an amount to be established at trial. As a further direct and proximate
11 result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, as set forth herein, Representative Plaintiff and Class
12 Members are also entitled to recover costs and attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of
13 Civil Procedure § 1021.5, among other authorities.

14 25. Representative Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant from
15 engaging in the complained-of illegal labor acts and practices in the future. Representative
16 Plaintiff also seeks restitution of costs incurred by Representative Plaintiff and Class Members
17 under California's Unfair Competition Law. Unless enjoined, Defendant's unlawful conduct will
18 continue unchecked, while Representative Plaintiff and Class Members bear the financial brunt
19 of Defendant's unlawful conduct. As a further direct and proximate result of Defendant's
20 unlawful conduct, as set forth herein, Representative Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class are also
21 entitled to recover costs and attorneys' fees, pursuant to statute.

22
23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**
UNLAWFUL FAILURE TO PAY WAGES
24 **(California Labor Code §§ 200-204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198; IWC Wage Order(s))**

25 30. Plaintiff incorporates in this cause of action each and every allegation of the
26 preceding paragraphs, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

27 31. During the limitations period, Plaintiff performed work for Defendant. The
28 number of hours will be proven at trial.

1 32. During the limitations period, Defendant refused to compensate Plaintiff for all of
2 the wages earned, in violation of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) and provisions of the
3 California Labor Code.

4 33. Defendant's conduct, as heretofore detailed, represents underpayment of wages
5 pursuant to California Labor Code § 558 for which Plaintiffs seek damages and/or penalties
6 according to proof.

7 34. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, as set forth
8 herein, Plaintiff has sustained damages, including loss of earnings for hours worked on behalf of
9 Defendant, in an amount to be established at trial. As a further direct and proximate result of
10 Defendant's unlawful conduct, as set forth herein, Plaintiff is entitled to recover penalties in
11 amounts to be established at trial, as well as attorneys' fees and costs, and restitution, pursuant to
12 statute.

13
14 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
15 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL AND REST PERIODS**
16 **(California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512)**

17 35. Representative Plaintiff incorporates in this cause of action each and every
18 allegation of the preceding paragraphs, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth
19 herein.

20 36. At all relevant times, Defendant was aware of and were under a duty to comply
21 with California Labor Code § 226.7 and §512.

22 37. California Labor Code § 226.7 provides:

23 (a) No employer shall require any employee to work during
24 any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the
25 Industrial Welfare Commission.

26 (b) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period
27 or rest period in accordance with an applicable order of the
28 Industrial Welfare Commission, the employer shall pay the
employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate
of compensation for each work day that the meal or rest period is
not provided.

38. Moreover, California Labor Code § 512(a) provides:

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

An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee. An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than 12 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

39. Sections 11 and 12, respectively, of the applicable IWC Wage Order mandate that employers provide all applicable meal and/or rest periods to non-exempt (including exempt-misclassified) employees.

40. Section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order provides:

- (A) No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes...
- (B) An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes...
- (C) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided.

41. Moreover, Section 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order provides:

- (A) Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof
....
- (B) If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

1 42. By failing to consistently provide uninterrupted thirty-minute meal periods within
2 the first five hours of work each day and/or uninterrupted net ten-minute rest periods to
3 Representative Plaintiff and Class Members, Defendant violated the California Labor Code and
4 applicable IWC Wage Order provisions.

5 43. Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, on that basis, alleges that
6 Defendant has never paid the one hour of compensation to any Class Member due to its
7 violations of the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order provisions.

8 44. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, as set forth
9 herein, Representative Plaintiff and Class Members have sustained damages, including lost
10 compensation resulting from missed meal and/or rest periods, in an amount to be established at
11 trial.

12 45. As a further direct and proximate result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, as set
13 forth herein, certain Class Members are entitled to recover other penalties, in amounts to be
14 established at trial, as well as recovery of attorneys' fees and costs, pursuant to statute.

15 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**
16 **UNLAWFUL FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES**
17 **(Violation of IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198)**

18 46. Representative Plaintiff incorporates in this cause of action each and every
19 allegation of the preceding paragraphs, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth
20 herein.

21 47. During the relevant time period, Representative Plaintiff and Class Members
22 worked, on many occasions, in excess of eight hours in a workday and/or 40 hours in a
23 workweek. The precise number of overtime hours will be proven at trial.

24 48. During the relevant time period, Defendant refused to compensate Representative
25 Plaintiff and Class Members for all of the overtime wages earned, in violation of the applicable
26 IWC Wage Order and provisions of the California Labor Code.

27 49. Moreover, during the relevant time period, Representative Plaintiff and certain
28 Class Members were employed by and thereafter terminated from Plaintiff's position with

1 Defendant, yet Representative Plaintiff and affected Class Members were not paid all wages due
2 upon said termination of employment. Said non-payment of all wages due was the direct and
3 proximate result of a willful refusal to do so by Defendant.

4 50. At all relevant times, Defendant was aware of, and were under a duty to comply
5 with, the overtime provisions of the California Labor Code including, but not limited to,
6 California Labor Code §§510, 1194, and 1198.

7 51. California Labor Code §510(a), in pertinent part, provides:

8 Any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in
9 excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours
10 worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be
compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the
regular rate of pay for an employee

11 52. California Labor Code §1194(a), in pertinent part, provides:

12 Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any
13 employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal
overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to
14 recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of
this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest
15 thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit.

16 53. California Labor Code §1198, in pertinent part, provides:

17 The maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor
18 fixed by the commission shall be the maximum hours of work and
the standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment of
19 any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or
under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.

20 54. By refusing to compensate Representative Plaintiff and certain Class Members for
21 overtime wages earned, Defendant violated those California Labor Code provisions cited herein
22 as well as the applicable IWC Wage Order(s).

23 55. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, as set forth
24 herein, Representative Plaintiff and certain Class Members have sustained damages, including
25 loss of earnings for hours of overtime worked on behalf of Defendant, in an amount to be
26 established at trial, and is entitled to recover attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

27
28

1
2 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
3 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**
4 **(California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1174)**

5 56. Representative Plaintiff incorporates in this cause of action each and every
6 allegation of the preceding paragraphs, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth
7 herein.

8 57. California Labor Code § 226(a) provides:

9 Each employer shall semimonthly, or at the time of each payment
10 of wages, furnish each of his or her employees either as a
11 detachable part of the check, draft or voucher paying the
12 employee's wages, or separately when wages are paid by personal
13 check or cash, an itemized wage statement in writing showing: (1)
14 gross wages earned; (2) total number of hours worked by each
15 employee whose compensation is based on an hourly wage; (3) all
16 deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of
17 the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item; (4) net
18 wages earned; (5) the inclusive date of the period for which the
19 employee is paid; (6) the name of the employee and his or her
20 social security number; and (7) the name and address of the legal
21 entity which is the employer.

22 58. Moreover, California Labor Code § 226(e) provides:

23 An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and
24 intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a)
25 is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty
26 dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs
27 and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in
28 a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of
four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs
and reasonable attorney's fees.

59. Finally, California Labor Code § 1174(d) provides:

Every person employing labor in this state shall. . . [k]eep, at a
central location in the state...payroll records showing the hours
worked daily by and the wages paid to...employees.... These
records shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this
purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file for
not less than two years.

60. Representative Plaintiff seeks to recover actual damages, costs, and attorneys'
fees under these provisions on behalf of himself and on behalf of all Class Members.

1 67. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's willful conduct in failing to pay
2 said Class Members for all hours worked, affected Class Members are entitled to recover
3 "waiting time" penalties of up to thirty days' wages pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 in
4 an amount to be established at trial, together with interest thereon, and attorneys' fees and costs.

5
6 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
7 **UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES UNDER THE UNFAIR COMPETITION ACT**
8 **(California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200-17208)**

9 68. Representative Plaintiff incorporates in this cause of action each and every
10 allegation of the preceding paragraphs, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth
11 herein.

12 69. Representative Plaintiff further brings this cause of action seeking equitable and
13 statutory relief to stop Defendant's misconduct, as complained of herein, and to seek restitution
14 of the amounts Defendant acquired through the unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent business
15 practices described herein.

16 70. Defendant's knowing conduct, as alleged herein, constitutes an unlawful and/or
17 fraudulent business practice, as set forth in California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200-
18 17208. Specifically, Defendant conducted business activities while failing to comply with the
19 legal mandates cited herein.

20 71. Defendant has clearly established a policy of accepting a certain amount of
21 collateral damage, as represented by the damages to the Representative Plaintiff and to Class
22 Members herein alleged, as incidental to its business operations, rather than accept the
23 alternative costs of full compliance with fair, lawful, and honest business practices, ordinarily
24 borne by its responsible competitors and as set forth in legislation and the judicial record.

25 **RELIEF SOUGHT**

26 **WHEREFORE, the Representative Plaintiff**, on behalf of himself and the proposed
27 Plaintiff Class, prays for judgment and the following specific relief against Defendant(s), and
28 each of them, jointly and separately, as follows:

1 1. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that this action is a proper class action
2 and certify the proposed Class and/or any other appropriate subclasses under California Code of
3 Civil Procedure § 382;

4 2. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendant willfully violated its
5 legal duties to pay all wages due under the California Labor Code and the applicable California
6 Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders;

7 3. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the overtime
8 provisions of the California Labor Code and the applicable California Industrial Welfare
9 Commission Wage Order as to Plaintiff;

10 4. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants willfully violated
11 their legal duties to pay overtime under the California Labor Code and the applicable California
12 Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders;

13 5. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Plaintiff was, at all times relevant
14 hereto, and is still, entitled to be paid overtime for work beyond 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in
15 a week;

16 6. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff of damages and/or restitution for the
17 amount of unpaid overtime compensation, including interest thereon, and penalties in an amount
18 to be proven at trial;

19 7. That the Court make an award to the Representative Plaintiff and the Class
20 Members of one hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday
21 that a meal period was not provided;

22 8. That the Court make an award to the Representative Plaintiff and the Class
23 Members of one hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday
24 that a rest period was not provided;

25 9. That the Court Order Defendant to pay restitution to the Representative Plaintiff
26 and the Class Members due to Defendant's unlawful activities, pursuant to California Business
27 and Professions Code §§ 17200-17208;

28

1 10. That the Court further enjoin Defendant, ordering it to cease and desist from
2 unlawful activities in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*

3 11. For all other Orders, findings and determinations identified and sought in this
4 Complaint;

5 12. For interest on the amount of any and all economic losses, at the prevailing legal
6 rate;

7 13. For reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §
8 1021.5; and

9 14. For costs of suit and any and all such other relief as the Court deems just and
10 proper.

11
12 **JURY DEMAND**

13 Representative Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Plaintiff Class, hereby demands a
14 trial by jury.

15
16 Dated: July 16, 2019

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC

17
18 By: 
19 Andrew Daniel Weaver, Esq.
20 Attorneys for Representative Plaintiff
21 and the Plaintiff Class

22
23
24
25
26
27
28