Fill in this information to identify the case:					
Debtor 1 Hometown Buffet, Inc.					
Debtor 2					
United States Bankruptcy Court for the: Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division					
Case number 21-30724-11					

E-Filed on 08/27/2021 Claim # 349

Official Form 410

Proof of Claim 04/19

Read the instructions before filling out this form. This form is for making a claim for payment in a bankruptcy case. Do not use this form to make a request for payment of an administrative expense. Make such a request according to 11 U.S.C. § 503.

Filers must leave out or redact information that is entitled to privacy on this form or on any attached documents. Attach redacted copies of any documents that support the claim, such as promissory notes, purchase orders, invoices, itemized statements of running accounts, contracts, judgments, mortgages, and security agreements. Do not send original documents; they may be destroyed after scanning. If the documents are not available, explain in an attachment.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Fill in all the information about the claim as of the date the case was filed. That date is on the notice of bankruptcy (Form 309) that you received.

Part 1: **Identify the Claim** Who is the current Susie Annette Valenzuela creditor? Name of the current creditor (the person or entity to be paid for this claim) Other names the creditor used with the debtor Has this claim been ✓ No acquired from ☐ Yes. From whom? someone else? 3. Where should notices Where should notices to the creditor be sent? Where should payments to the creditor be sent? (if and payments to the different) creditor be sent? Bibiyan Law Group, P.C. Federal Rule of Name Bankruptcy Procedure 8484 Wilshire Blvd, Ste 500 (FRBP) 2002(g) Number Street Number Street 90211 **Beverly Hills** State ZIP Code Contact phone (310) 438-5555 Contact email david@tomorrowlaw.com Contact email Uniform claim identifier for electronic payments in chapter 13 (if you use one): ✓ No Does this claim amend one already filed? ☐ Yes. Claim number on court claims registry (if known) ____ Filed on MM / DD / YYYY ✓ No 5. Do you know if anyone else has filed a proof ☐ Yes. Who made the earlier filing? of claim for this claim?

6.	Do you have any number you use to identify the debtor?	se to identify the Yes. Last 4 digits of the debtor's account or any number you use to identify the debtor:						
7.	How much is the claim?	\$						
3.	What is the basis of the claim?	Examples: Goods sold, money loaned, lease, services performed, personal injury or wrongful death, or credit card. Attach redacted copies of any documents supporting the claim required by Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c). Limit disclosing information that is entitled to privacy, such as health care information. Wrongful Termination Litigation						
9.	Is all or part of the claim secured?	No Yes. The claim is secured by a lien on property. Nature of property: Real estate. If the claim is secured by the debtor's principal residence, file a Mortgage Proof of Claim Attachment (Official Form 410-A) with this Proof of Claim. Motor vehicle Other. Describe: Basis for perfection: Attach redacted copies of documents, if any, that show evidence of perfection of a security interest (for example, a mortgage, lien, certificate of title, financing statement, or other document that shows the lien has been filed or recorded.)						
		Value of property: \$						
		Amount of the claim that is secured: \$						
		Amount of the claim that is unsecured: \$(The sum of the secured and unsecured amounts should match the amount in line 7.						
		Amount necessary to cure any default as of the date of the petition: \$						
		Annual Interest Rate (when case was filed)% ☐ Fixed ☐ Variable						
10	. Is this claim based on a lease?	✓ No Yes. Amount necessary to cure any default as of the date of the petition. \$						
11	. Is this claim subject to a right of setoff?	✓ No ✓ Yes. Identify the property:						

12. Is all or part of the claim	☑ No						
entitled to priority under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)?	☐ Yes. Check one:					Amount enti	itled to priority
A claim may be partly priority and partly		estic support obligations (including alimony and child support) under .S.C. § 507(a)(1)(A) or (a)(1)(B).					0.00
nonpriority. For example, in some categories, the law limits the amount entitled to priority.		3,025* of deposits toward pure I, family, or household use. 1		of property	or services for	\$	0.00
,	bankrup	rages, salaries, or commissions (up to \$13,650*) earned within 180 days before the ankruptcy petition is filed or the debtor's business ends, whichever is earlier. I U.S.C. § 507(a)(4).					0.00
	☐ Taxes o	axes or penalties owed to governmental units. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(8).					0.00
	☐ Contribu	utions to an employee benefit	plan. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a	a)(5).		\$	0.00
	☐ Other. Specify subsection of 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)() that applies. \$					\$	0.00
	* Amounts a	re subject to adjustment on 4/01/	22 and every 3 years after	that for cas	ses begun on or aft	er the date of adj	justment.
Part 3: Sign Below							
The person completing	Check the appro	priate box:					
this proof of claim must sign and date it.	☐ I am the cre	ditor.					
FRBP 9011(b).		ditor's attorney or authorized	agent.				
If you file this claim	_	stee, or the debtor, or their au	· ·	ptcy Rule	3004.		
electronically, FRBP 5005(a)(2) authorizes courts	I am a guarantor, surety, endorser, or other codebtor. Bankruptcy Rule 3005.						
to establish local rules							
specifying what a signature is.	I understand that an authorized signature on this <i>Proof of Claim</i> serves as an acknowledgment that when calculating the						
A person who files a	amount of the claim, the creditor gave the debtor credit for any payments received toward the debt.						
fraudulent claim could be fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5	I have examined the information in this <i>Proof of Claim</i> and have a reasonable belief that the information is true and correct.						
years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.						
3371.	Executed on date	e <u>08/27/2021</u> MM / DD / YYYY					
	April Kimn Signature	n of the person who is compl	eting and signing this	claim:	_		
		April Kimm					
	Name	First name	Middle name		Last name		
	Title	Director					
	Company	Dundon Advisers LLC Identify the corporate servicer as the company if the authorized agent is a servicer.					
	Address	440 Mamaroneck Av	ve, Ste 507				
		Harrison		NY	10528		
		City		State	ZIP Code		
	Contact phone	(914) 341-1188		Email a	ık@ <u>dundon.c</u>	com	

Attachment 1 - Valenzuela Wrongful Termination Complaint.pdf Description -

1	BIBIYAN LAW GROUP	
2	A Professional Corporation David D. Bibiyan (SBN 287811)	
3	david@tomorrowlaw.com Diego Aviles (SBN 315533)	
4	diego@tomorrowlaw.com Sara Ehsani-Nia (SBN 326501)	
5	sara@tomorrowlaw.com Anton Swain-Gil (SBN 323237)	
6	anton@tomorrowlaw.com 8484 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 500	
7	Beverly Hills, California 90211 Telephone: (310) 438-5555 Facsimile: (310) 300-1705	
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff, SUSIE ANNETTE VALENZUELA	
9		IE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS A	NGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT
11		
12	OLICIE ANNIETTE VAI ENZUELA	CASE NO.:
13	SUSIE ANNETTE VALENZUELA, an individual,	CASE NO.: COMPLAINT FOR:
14	D1-:-4:66	
15	Plaintiff,	(1) DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION;(2) HARASSMENT;(3) FAILURE TO PROVIDE
16	V.	REASONBLE ACCOMMODATION; (4) FAILURE TO ENGAGE IN A GOOD
17	HOMETOWN BUFFET, INC., a Minnesota corporation; BUFFETS, LLC, a Minnesota	(5) FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEDICAL
18	limited liability company; ALAMO BUFFETS PAYROLL, LLC, a Texas limited liability	LEAVE; (6) RETALIATION; (7) FAILURE TO PREVENT
19	company; FOOD MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, INC., a Texas corporation;	DISCRIMINATION, HARASSMENT, AND RETALIATION;
20	MARTA CARILLO, an individual; VERONICA VENCES, an individual; and	(8) WRONGFUL TERMINATION; (9) WRONGFUL TERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY;
21	DOES 1 through 100, Inclusive,	(10) FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES:
22	Defendants.	(11) FAÏLURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES; (12) MEAL BEDIOD VIOLATIONS.
23		(12) MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS; (13) REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS; (14) WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS;
24		(15) WAITING TIME PENALTIES; (16) FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY;
25		(17) UNFAIR COMPETITION; and (18) INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS.
26		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
27		[Amount in Controversy Exceeds \$25,000]
28 of		· · · · ·

Law Offices of
BIBIYAN LAW GROUP
A Professional Corporation
1801 Century Park East, Suite 2600
Los Angeles, California 90067
(310) 438-5555

COMPLAINT

COMES NOW plaintiff, SUSIE ANNETTE VALENZUELA ("Ms. Valenzuela" or "Plaintiff"), as and for her Complaint, who complains and alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff Ms. Valenzuela is, and at all times relevant hereto was, an individual residing in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.
- 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that she suffered from debilitating head pain that limited the major life activity of working. Plaintiff is informed and believes that she was terminated form her employment, discriminated against, retaliated against, and harassed on the basis of her physical disability. Due to her physical disability, Plaintiff is entitled to protection under California Department Fair Employment and Housing Act under Government Code section 12900, et seq. (hereinafter "FEHA") and the California common law.
- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that defendant HOMETOWN BUFFET, INC. ("HOMETOWN"), is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Minnesota and doing business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, with its principal office located at 120 Chula Vista, Hollywood Park, Texas 78232. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that HOMETOWN owns and operates numerous restaurants in California, regularly employs five or more employees and falls within the definition of "Employer" in Government Code section 12926, subdivision (d).
- 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that defendant BUFFETS, LLC. ("BUFFETS"), is, and at all times relevant hereto was. a limited liability company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Minnesota and doing business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, with its principal office located at 120 Chula Vista, Hollywood Park, Texas 78232. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that BUFFETS owns and operates numerous restaurants in California, regularly employs five or more employees and falls within the definition of "Employer" in Government Code section 12926, subdivision (d).
 - 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that defendant

ALAMO BUFFETS PAYROLL, LLC. ("ALAMO"), is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Texas and doing business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that ALAMO owns and operates numerous restaurants in California, regularly employs five or more employees and falls within the definition of "Employer" in Government Code section 12926, subdivision (d).

- 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that defendant FOOD MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, INC. ("FMP"), is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Texas and doing business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that FMP owns and operates numerous restaurants in California, regularly employs five or more employees and falls within the definition of "Employer" in Government Code section 12926, subdivision (d).
- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that defendant MARTA CARILLO ("CARILLO") is, and at all times relevant hereto was, an individual residing in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that CARILLO is, and at all times relevant hereto was. a General Manager employed by HOMETOWN. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and based thereon alleges that CARILLO violated, or caused to be violated, the above-referenced and below-referenced Labor Code provisions in violation of Labor Code section 558.1
- 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that defendant VERONICA VENCES ("VENCES") is, and at all times relevant hereto was, an individual residing in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that VENCES is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a Regional Manager employed by HOMETOWN. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and based thereon alleges that VENCES violated, or caused to be violated, the above-referenced and below-referenced Labor Code provisions in violation of Labor Code section 558.1
 - 9. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate or associate, or

19

13

14

15

16

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

otherwise, of the defendants named herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues said defendants by such fictitious names pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 474, and Plaintiff will amend this complaint to show their true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that all defendants sued herein as DOES are in some manner responsible for the acts herein alleged and that Plaintiff's damages were proximately caused by their conduct. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each defendant acted in all respects pertinent to this action, as the agent of the other defendant(s), carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally attributable to the other defendants. Whenever, heretofore or hereinafter, reference is made to "Defendants," it shall include HOMETOWN, BUFFETS, ALAMO. FMP, and any of their parent, subsidiary, or affiliated companies within the State of California, as well as CARILLO, VENCES, and DOES 1 through 100 identified herein.

JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS

- 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, each of the defendants was the agent, principal, employee, employer, representative, joint venture or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, either actually or ostensibly, and in doing the things alleged herein acted within the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, and conspiracy.
- All of the acts and conduct described herein of each and every corporate defendant 11. was duly authorized, ordered, and directed by the respective and collective defendant corporate employers, and the officers and management-level employees of said corporate employers. In addition thereto, said corporate employers participated in the aforementioned acts and conduct of their said employees, agents, and representatives, and each of them; and upon completion of the aforesaid acts and conduct of said corporate employees, agents, and representatives, the defendant corporation respectively and collectively ratified, accepted the benefits of condoned, lauded, acquiesced, authorized, and otherwise approved of each and all of the said acts and conduct of the aforementioned corporate employees, agents and representatives.

- 12. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that CARILLO and VENCES violated, or caused to be violated, the above-referenced and below-referenced Labor Code provisions in violation of Labor Code section 558.1.
- 13. As a result of the aforementioned facts, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are joint employers.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 14. In or around June of 2005, Defendants hired Plaintiff as a full-time employee, with duties that included, without limitation, bussing tables, stocking items, washing dishes, taking in customer complaints, cashing out cashiers, and working a register. Plaintiff always performed her duties in a competent manner.
- 15. Throughout Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, she worked at several of Defendants' restaurants, all of which are located in the County of Los Angeles. State of California. Plaintiff primarily worked at Defendants' restaurant located at 4700 Candlewood Street, Lakewood, California 90712.
 - 16. In or around July of 2019, Ms. Valenzuela suffered from unbearable head pain.
- 17. In or around late July of 2019, Ms. Valenzuela requested from Defendants that she be allowed to leave work early due to her unbearable head pain and informed Defendants' Human Resources Department that she had made that request.
- 18. The following day, Plaintiff sought treatment from a medical professional, who placed Plaintiff off of work for three days.
 - 19. Plaintiff provided her medical professional's recommendation to Defendants.
- 20. When Ms. Valenzuela returned to work, CARILLO and VENCES attempted to discipline Plaintiff for having left work due to her unbearable head pain.
- 21. In or around early August of 2019, Plaintiff continued to suffer from debilitating head pain and again sought treatment from a medical health professional, who recommended that Plaintiff be placed off of work for a week.
- 22. Plaintiff provided the medical professional's recommendation that Plaintiff take a week off of work due to her debilitating head pain to CARILLO.

13 14

12

15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26 27

28

- In or around September of 2019, Plaintiff had a particularly acute episode of head 23. pain that was so severe that it caused her to tear up. Plaintiff asked CARILLO if Plaintiff could leave work early due to her severe head pain.
- CARILLO initially refused Plaintiff's request to leave work early and reprimanded 24. Plaintiff for asking. Only after the intervention of another manager, Plaintiff was eventually allowed to leave work early that day.
- 25. The next time Plaintiff attempted to clock in to work. CARILLO told Plaintiff that she was suspended for having left work, even though Plaintiff had originally been authorized to do so. VENCES also told Plaintiff that they would they needed to talk to following day.
- 26. When Plaintiff showed up for work the following day, on or around September 25, 2019, CARILLO and VENCES told Plaintiff that her employment was terminated.
- 27. Plaintiff, at all times pertinent hereto, was a non-exempt employee within the meaning of the California Labor Code, and the implementing rules and regulations of the IWC California Wage Orders
- 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that throughout her employment, Plaintiff was not paid one-and-a-half times the regular rate of pay for work performed over eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and seven consecutive work days in a work week without being properly compensated for hours worked in excess of (8) hours per day in a work day, forty (40) hours per week in a work week, and/or hours worked on the seventh consecutive work day in a work week by, among other things, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all hours actually worked at the proper overtime rate of pay; detrimentally rounding time entries; detrimentally editing and/or manipulation of time entries; and engaging, suffering or permitting Plaintiff to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring Plaintiff to don and doff required work uniforms off the clock.
- 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that throughout her employment, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff at the regular rate of pay for all minimum wages due, as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all hours actually worked; detrimentally rounding time entries; detrimentally editing and/or manipulation of time

entries; and engaging, suffering, or permitting Plaintiff to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring Plaintiff to don and doff required work uniforms off the clock.

- 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that throughout her employment, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with thirty (30) minute timely and uninterrupted meal periods for days on which she worked more than five (5) hours in a work day and a second timely thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal period for days on which she worked in excess of ten (10) hours in a work day, and failed to provide compensation for such unprovided or untimely meal periods as required by California wage and hour laws.
- 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that throughout her employment, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with uninterrupted and timely paid rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes per four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof and failed to provide compensation for such unprovided or untimely rest periods as required by California wage and hour laws.
- 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that throughout her employment, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff with itemized wage statements that accurately reflected, among other things: gross wages earned and paid; total hours worked by Plaintiff; net wages earned and paid; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).
- 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that at the time Plaintiff's employment ended, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff the full amount of her wages due upon termination and/or resignation, as required by Labor Code sections 201 and 202.
- 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that throughout her employment, Defendants failed to indemnify Plaintiff for the out-of-pocket expenses incurred in furtherance of her work duties, including but not limited to, costs incurred for driving her personal vehicle, including mileage and gas, separately laundering her mandatory work uniform, and the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans.

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

Plaintiff filed a complaint with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing 11. ("DFEH") against Defendants and obtained the Notice of Right to Sue on November 20, 2020, thereby exhausting her administrative remedies.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 12. Jurisdiction exists in the Superior Court of the State of California pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 410.10.
- Venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles, California pursuant to Code of Civil 13. Procedure sections 392, et seq. and Government Code section 12965, subdivision (b), because, among other things, Los Angeles County is the county in which the unlawful practices herein alleged have been committed, is the county in which the records relevant to the practices are maintained, and is the county in which Plaintiff worked for Defendants.
- 14. The amount of damages sought by Plaintiff herein exceeds the minimum jurisdictional limit of this Court: \$25,000.00.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Disability Discrimination – Against All Defendants)

- 15. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth hereat.
- 16. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff was an employee within the meaning of California Government Code section 12926, and at all times during her employment she performed in a competent, satisfactory manner.
- 17. Government Code section 12920 identifies the policy of this State to be the protection and safeguarding of the right and opportunity of all persons to seek, obtain and hold employment without discrimination on the basis of their disabilities, disability-related activities, complaints against unlawful employment practices, age, race and/or national origin. Therefore, by terminating Plaintiff's employment in the manner herein alleged, Defendants violated the fundamental public policies of this State codified by Government Code section 12900, et seq.
 - Plaintiff is informed and believes that she was discriminated against during her 18.

employment with Defendants on the basis of her physical disabilities arising from her debilitating head pain in violation of, *inter alia*, Government Code section 12940, subdivision (a).

- 19. Plaintiff filed Charges of Discrimination with the DFEH. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies, received her Notice of Right to Sue, and timely files this action.
- 20. At all times mentioned herein, Defendant knew that Plaintiff suffered from physical disabilities related to her debilitating head pain that required treatment from her healthcare provider. Plaintiff is informed and believes that her employment was terminated as a result of her physical disabilities in violation of, *inter alia*, Government Code section 12940, subdivision (a).
- 21. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that in addition to the practices enumerated above, Defendants may have engaged in other discriminatory practices against her which are not yet fully known. At such time as such discriminatory practices become known, Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint in that regard.
- 22. As a direct, foreseeable, legal and proximate result of Defendants' illegal conduct, acts, and/or omissions, as herein alleged, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer, substantial losses in earnings and job benefits, humiliation, embarrassment, mental and emotional distress and discomfort, security, solace, and peace of mind for which Plaintiff entered the employment relationship with Defendants, all to Plaintiff's damage in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 23. As further direct, foreseeable, legal and proximate result of said discriminatory conduct, acts, and/or omissions, Plaintiff has also been caused to retain attorneys and has thus incurred legal fees, expenses and costs, entitling her to reimbursement of same pursuant to Government Code section 12965, subdivision (b), in amount to be proven.
- 24. Furthermore, Defendants committed the illegal acts and/or omissions described herein deliberately, intentionally, oppressively, fraudulently, maliciously and in conscious disregard for Plaintiff's rights and safety. As such, Defendants acted in a willful and intentional manner and their conduct continues to be despicable, malicious and outrageous in that it has caused and continues to cause Plaintiff to needlessly suffer cruel and unjust hardship. Therefore, Defendants' conduct, as herein alleged, justifies an award of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount sufficient to deter them from ever engaging in such conduct again in the future.

Punitive and exemplary damages are further warranted to deter other employers who are similarly situated to Defendants from also behaving in the same manner as Defendants.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Harassment – Against All Defendants)

- 25. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 26. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants were employers within the meaning of Government Code section 12926.
- 27. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff was an employee within the meaning of California Government Code section 12926, and at all times during her employment she performed in a competent, satisfactory manner.
- 28. At all times relevant herein, California Government Code section 12940, subdivision (j) prohibited employers from harassing employees on the basis of their physical disability.
- 29. California Government Code section 12940, subdivision (j) further provides that harassment of an employee shall be unlawful if the entity, or its agents or supervisors, know or should have known of the conduct and fail to take immediate and appropriate corrective action.
- 30. As identified herein, during Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Defendants engaged in actions that constituted harassment of Plaintiff on the basis of her physical disabilities. Defendants failed to take immediate and appropriate action to prevent harassment against Plaintiff. Further, on or around September 5, 2019, Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment. These actions created a hostile working environment for Plaintiff.
- 31. Plaintiff filed Charges of Discrimination with the DFEH. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies, received her Notice of Right to Sue, and timely files this action.
- 32. As a direct, foreseeable, legal and proximate result of Defendants' illegal conduct, acts, and/or omissions, as herein alleged, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer, substantial losses in earnings and job benefits, humiliation, embarrassment, mental and emotional distress, discomfort, and a lack of security, solace, and peace of mind for which Plaintiff entered the

employment relationship with Defendants, all to Plaintiff's damage in an amount to be proven at trial.

- 33. As further direct, foreseeable, legal and proximate result of said unlawful conduct, acts, and/or omissions, Plaintiff has also been caused to retain attorneys and has thus incurred legal fees, expenses and costs, entitling her to reimbursement of the same pursuant to Government Code section 12965, subdivision (b), in amount to be proven.
- 34. Furthermore, Defendants committed the illegal acts and/or omissions described herein deliberately, intentionally, oppressively, fraudulently, maliciously and in conscious disregard for Plaintiff's rights and safety. As such, Defendants acted in a willful and intentional manner and their conduct continues to be despicable, malicious and outrageous in that it has caused and continues to cause Plaintiff to needlessly suffer cruel and unjust hardship. Therefore, Defendants' conduct, as herein alleged, justifies an award of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount sufficient to deter them from ever engaging in such conduct again in the future. Punitive and exemplary damages are further warranted to deter other employers who are similarly situated to Defendants from also behaving in the same manner as Defendants.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Provide Reasonable Accommodation – Against All Defendants)

- 35. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 36. While working with Defendants, Plaintiff requested accommodations in connection with her physical disability, including, without limitation: temporary absence from work for rest or to attend doctors' appointments and modified working hours.
- 37. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants failed and refused to grant Plaintiff's requests for reasonable accommodations for conditions/disabilities related to her physical disability in violation of the FEHA, codified at Government Code section 12900, *et seq.* Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that the reasonable accommodations she requested would not have created an undue burden for Defendants.
 - 38. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants were employers within the meaning of

Government Code section 12926.

- 39. At all times during her employment, Plaintiff could competently perform her job duties with or without a reasonable accommodation.
- 40. Plaintiff filed Charges of Discrimination with the DFEH. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies, received her Notice of Right to Sue, and timely files this Action.
- 41. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that in addition to the practices enumerated above, Defendants may have engaged in other discriminatory practices against her which are not fully known yet. At such time as such discriminatory practices become known to her, Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint in that regard.
- 42. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has sustained, and continues to sustain, loss of earnings and benefits, the full nature and extent of which are presently unknown to Plaintiff, who, therefore, will seek leave of Court to amend her Complaint at such time as these damages are fully ascertained.
- 43. As a further direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct against her in violation of Government Code section 12900, et seq. as heretofore described. Plaintiff has been damaged and deprived of the security, solace, and peace of mind for which she entered the employment relationship with Defendants, and each of the, thereby causing her to suffer emotional and mental distress, anguish, embarrassment, and humiliation, all to her general damages in an amount according to proof at trial, but in excess of the jurisdictional amount of this Court.
- 44. As a further result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has incurred, and will continue to incur, attorney's fees and costs and is entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs from Defendants pursuant to Government Code section 12965.
- 45. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that the outrageous conduct of Defendants described above was done with malice, fraud, and oppression with conscious disregard for her rights and with the intent, design, and purpose of injuring her. Defendants, through their officers, managing agents, and/or supervisors, authorized, condoned and/or ratified the unlawful conduct of all of the other Defendants named in this Action. By reason thereof, Plaintiff is entitled to punitive or exemplary damages from Defendants in a sum according

3

1

4

5

6 7

8 9

10

12 13

11

14

15

16 17

18

20

19

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Engage in a Good Faith Interactive Process – Against All Defendants)

- Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in 46. the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 47. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff was an employee within the meaning of Government Code section 12926, and at all times relevant performed in a competent, satisfactory manner.
- 48. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants were employers within the meaning of Government Code section 12926.
- 49. FEHA requires an employer who knows, or has reason to know, of an employee's disability, or regards and employee a disabled, to engaged in a timely good faith interactive process to identify all available accommodations. The interactive process mandates an employer to engage the employee in an open dialogue and good-faith exploration of all possible available accommodations, including other suitable job opportunities.
- 50. Government Code section 12940(n) makes an employer's failure to engage an employee with a known and/or perceived disability in a timely, good faith interactive process unlawful.
- 51. As a result of her disability, Plaintiff requested reasonable accommodations, including taking time off for a doctors' appointments or rest and modified working hours. Despite knowing of Plaintiff's actual and/or perceived disabilities and despite knowing of her need for reasonable accommodations, as herein alleged, Defendants failed to engage her in a timely, good faith interactive process to identify all available accommodations in violation of Government Code section 12940(n). Had Defendants carried out their duty under FEHA, reasonable accommodations could have been identified, enabling her to continue performing the essential functions of her job.
- 52. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges. that the reasonable accommodations she requested would not have created an undue burden for Defendants.

53. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that in addition to the practices enumerated above, Defendants may have engaged in other discriminatory practices against her which are not fully known yet. At such time as such discriminatory practices become known to her, Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint in that regard.

- 54. Plaintiff filed Charges of Discrimination with the DFEH. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies, received her Notice of Right to Sue, and timely files this Action.
- 55. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has sustained, and continues to sustain, loss of earnings and benefits, the full nature and extent of which are presently unknown to Plaintiff, who, therefore, will seek leave of Court to amend her Complaint at such time as these damages are fully ascertained.
- 56. As a further direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct against her in violation of Government Code section 12940, subdivision (n), Plaintiff has been damaged and deprived of the security, solace, and peace of mind for which she entered the employment relationship with Defendants, and each of the, thereby causing her to suffer emotional and mental distress, anguish, embarrassment, and humiliation, all to her general damages in an amount according to proof at trial, but in excess of the jurisdictional amount of this Court.
- 57. As a further result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has incurred, and will continue to incur, attorney's fees and costs and is entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs from Defendants pursuant to Government Code section 12965.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew about Plaintiff's disability and need for reasonable accommodations yet they oppressively, fraudulently, maliciously and in conscious disregard for Plaintiff's rights and safety failed to engage in the requisite interactive process. As such, Defendants acted in a willful and intentional manner and their conduct, as herein described, was and continues to be despicable, malicious and outrageous in that it has caused Plaintiff to needlessly suffer cruel and unjust hardship. Therefore, Defendants' conduct, acts and/or omissions, as herein alleged, justify an award of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount sufficient to deter them from ever engaging in such conduct again in the future. Punitive and exemplary damages are further warranted to deter other

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

3

4

(Denial of Medical Leave - Against All Defendants)

Defendants are subject to the laws of the State of California and are entities subject

5

60.

59. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

6 7

to suit for failing to provide Plaintiff with medical leave as required under the California Family Rights Act ("CFRA"), codified at Government Code Section 12945.2, in that each of the

8

Defendants is an employer who regularly employs fifty (50) or more persons.

10

In or about July of 2019, and through the time of her termination, including in or 61. around September of 2019, when Plaintiff requested leave for treatment and rest due to her serious

11

health condition, she qualified for twelve (12) weeks of leave under CFRA because the reason for

12

her leave was a serious health condition, she had worked for Defendants in excess of twelve (12)

13 14

months, and she had at least 1,250 hours of service with Defendants.

15

62. Under CFRA, medical leave requested pursuant to that law is not deemed to have been granted unless the employer provides the employee, upon granting the leave request, a

17

16

guarantee of employment in the same or comparable position upon the termination of the leave.

18

63. By failing to guarantee Plaintiff her same or comparable position upon the completion of her medical leave, and by terminating her shortly thereafter, Defendants, and each

19

of them, failed to grant Plaintiff her legally entitled medical leave in violation of CFRA.

21

20

At all times during her employment, Plaintiff could competently perform her job 64. duties with or without a reasonable accommodation.

23

22

65. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that the reasonable period of time that she requested for medical leave would not have created an undue burden for

24 25

Defendants.

26

66. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that in addition to the

27

28

practices enumerated above, Defendants may have engaged in other discriminatory practices against her which are not fully known yet. At such time as such discriminatory practices become

known to her, Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint in that regard.

- 67. Plaintiff filed Charges of Discrimination with the DFEH. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies, received her Notice of Right to Sue, and timely files this Action.
- As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has sustained, and continues to sustain, loss of earnings and benefits, the full nature and extent of which are presently unknown to Plaintiff, who, therefore, will seek leave of Court to amend her Complaint at such time as these damages are fully ascertained.
- 69. As a further direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has been damaged and deprived of the security, solace, and peace of mind for which she entered the employment relationship with Defendants, and each of them, thereby causing her to suffer emotional and mental distress, anguish, embarrassment, and humiliation. all to her general damages in an amount according to proof at trial, but in excess of the jurisdictional amount of this Court.
- 70. As a further result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has incurred, and will continue to incur, attorney's fees and costs and is entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs from Defendants pursuant to Government Code section 12965.
- 71. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that the outrageous conduct of Defendants described above was done with malice, fraud, and oppression with conscious disregard for her rights and with the intent, design, and purpose of injuring her. Defendants, through their officers, managing agents, and/or supervisors, authorized, condoned and/or ratified the unlawful conduct of all of the other Defendants named in this Action. By reason thereof, Plaintiff is entitled to punitive or exemplary damages from all Defendants in a sum according to proof of at trial.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Retaliation - Against All Defendants)

- 72. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
 - 73. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants were employers within the meaning of

- of the California Code of Regulations makes it unlawful for an employer to retaliate against a person for requesting an accommodation based on a disability. Moreover. Government Code section 12945.2(I) and section 11094 of the California Code of Regulations prohibit an employer from retaliating against an employee for exercising their right to leave under CFRA.
- 75. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that, among other things, that when Plaintiff suffered a physical disability, requested reasonable accommodations, and requested medical leave, she was subjected to retaliation, including, without limitation, denial of full employment benefits, denial of a good faith, interactive process, denial of accommodation, denial of leave, reprimand, and termination by Defendants.
- 76. At all times during her employment, Plaintiff could competently perform her job duties with or without a reasonable accommodation.
- 77. Plaintiff filed Charges of Discrimination with the DFEH. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies, received her Notice of Right to Sue, and timely files this Action.
- 78. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' willful, knowing and intentional retaliatory conduct against her, Plaintiff has sustained, and continues to sustain, loss of earnings and benefits, the full nature and extent of which are presently unknown to Plaintiff, who, therefore, will seek leave of Court to amend her Complaint at such time as these damages are fully ascertained.
- 79. As a further direct and proximate result of Defendants' retaliatory conduct against her in violation of Government Code sections 12940 and 12945.2, as heretofore described, Plaintiff has been damaged and deprived of the security, solace, and peace of mind for which she entered the employment relationship with Defendants, and each of them, thereby causing her to suffer emotional and mental distress, anguish, embarrassment, and humiliation, all to her general damages in an amount according to proof at trial, but in excess of the jurisdictional amount of this Court.
 - 80. As a further result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has incurred, and will continue

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

to incur, attorney's fees and costs and is entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs from Defendants pursuant to Government Code section 12965.

Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that, furthermore, 81. Defendants committed the retaliatory conduct, acts and/or omissions described and alleged herein, deliberately, intentionally, oppressively, fraudulently, maliciously and in conscious disregard for Plaintiff's rights and safety. As such, Defendants acted in a willful and intentional manner and their conduct, as herein set forth, was and continues to be despicable, malicious and outrageous in that it caused Plaintiff to needlessly suffer cruel and unjust hardship. Therefore, Defendants retaliatory conduct, acts and/or omissions, as herein alleged, justifies an award of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount sufficient to deter them from ever engaging in such conduct again in the future. Punitive and exemplary damages are further warranted to deter other employers who are similarly situated to Defendants from also behaving in the same manner as Defendants.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Prevent Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation in Violation of Government Code § 12940(k) - Against All Defendants)

- 82. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 83. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants were employers within the meaning of Government Code section 12926.
- 84. At all relevant times hereto, Plaintiff was an employee within the meaning of Government Code section 12926 and at all times during her employment she performed in a competent, satisfactory manner.
- 85. Government Code section 12940, subdivision (k). makes it unlawful for an employer to "fail to take all reasonable steps necessary to prevent discrimination and harassment from occurring."
- 86. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants violated Government Code section 12940, subdivision (k) by failing to take all reasonable steps to prevent discrimination,

harassment, and retaliation against Plaintiff from occurring when Defendants knew that Plaintiff was being illegally discriminated against, harassed, and retaliated against.

- 87. Plaintiff filed Charges of Discrimination with the DFEH. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies, received her Notice of Right to Sue, and timely files this Action.
- 88. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' willful, knowing and intentional unlawful conduct, Plaintiff has sustained, and continues to sustain, loss of earnings and benefits, the full nature and extent of which are presently unknown to Plaintiff, who, therefore, will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint at such time as these damages are fully ascertained.
- 89. As a further direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as heretofore described, Plaintiff has been damaged and deprived of the security, solace, and peace of mind for which she entered the employment relationship with Defendants, and each of them, thereby causing her to suffer emotional and mental distress, anguish, embarrassment, and humiliation, all to her general damages in an amount according to proof at trial, but in excess of the jurisdictional amount of this Court.
- 90. As a further result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has incurred, and will continue to incur, attorney's fees and costs and is entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs from Defendants pursuant to Government Code section 12965.
- 91. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that, furthermore, Defendants committed unlawful conduct, acts and/or omissions described and alleged herein, deliberately, intentionally, oppressively, fraudulently, maliciously and in conscious disregard for Plaintiff's rights and safety. As such, Defendants acted in a willful and intentional manner and their conduct, as herein set forth, was and continues to be despicable, malicious and outrageous in that it caused Plaintiff to needlessly suffer cruel and unjust hardship. Therefore, Defendants' unlawful conduct, acts and/or omissions, as herein alleged, justify an award of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount sufficient to deter them from ever engaging in such conduct again in the future. Punitive and exemplary damages are further warranted to deter other employers who are similarly situated to Defendants from also behaving in the same manner as Defendants.

7

10

14

15

17

16

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27 28

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Wrongful Termination - Against All Defendants)

- Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in 92. the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- At all times relevant hereto, Defendants were employers within the meaning of 93. Government Code section 12926.
- 94. At relevant times, Plaintiff was an employee within the meaning of Government Code section 12926 and at all times during her employment she could perform in a competent, satisfactory manner.
- 95. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that her employment was terminated as a result of her physical disability and her requests for reasonable accommodations and medical leave in violation of Government Code sections 12940 and 12945.2.
- 96. Plaintiff filed Charges of Discrimination with the DFEH. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies, received her Notice of Right to Sue, and timely files this Action.
- 97. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct against her in violation of Government Code sections 12940 and 12945.2, Plaintiff has sustained, and continues to sustain, loss of earnings and benefits, the full nature and extent of which are presently unknown to Plaintiff, who, therefore, will seek leave of Court to amend her Complaint at such time as these damages are fully ascertained.
- 98. As a further direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct against her in violation of Government Code sections 12940 and 12945.2, as heretofore described, Plaintiff has been damaged and deprived of the security, solace, and peace of mind for which she entered the employment relationship with Defendants, and each of them, thereby causing her to suffer emotional and mental distress, anguish, embarrassment, and humiliation. all to her general damages in an amount according to proof at trial, but in excess of the jurisdictional amount of this Court.
- 99. As a further result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has incurred, and will continue to incur, attorney's fees and costs and is entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs

from Defendants pursuant to Government Code section 12965.

100. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that the outrageous conduct of Defendants described above was done with malice, fraud, and oppression with conscious disregard for her rights and with the intent, design, and purpose of injuring her. Defendants, through their officers, managing agents, and/or supervisors, authorized, condoned and/or ratified the unlawful conduct of all of the other Defendants named in this Action. By reason thereof, Plaintiff is entitled to punitive or exemplary damages from all Defendants in a sum according to proof of at trial.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy – Against All Defendants)

- 101. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 102. It is the public policy of the State of California as expressed in the FEHA and the that individuals shall not be terminated from their employment due to their physical disability or requesting reasonable accommodations therefor.
- 103. It is the public policy of the State of California as expressed in CFRA that individuals shall not be terminated from their employment due to exercising their right to medical leave under CFRA.
- 104. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that her employment was terminated, and she was discriminated against, as a result of her disability, requesting reasonable accommodations, and attempting to exercise her right to medical leave under CFRA.
- 105. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that her disabilities, requests for accommodation, and attempts to exercise her rights under CFRA were substantial motivating reasons for Plaintiff's discharge.
- 106. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful termination of Plaintiff's employment in violation of public policy, Plaintiff has sustained, and continues to sustain, loss of earnings and benefits, the full nature and extent of which are presently unknown to Plaintiff, who, therefore, will seek leave of court to amend her complaint at such time as these damages are fully

6 7

9

8

11

10

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

21

22

20

23

24

25 26

27 28

As a further direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful termination of 107. Plaintiff's employment in violation of public policy, Plaintiff has been damaged and deprived of the security, solace, and peace of mind for which she entered the employment relationship with Defendants, and each of them, thereby causing her to suffer emotional and mental distress, anguish, embarrassment, and humiliation, all to her general damages in an amount according to proof at trial, but in excess of the jurisdictional amount of this Court.

Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges. that the outrageous 108. conduct of Defendants described above was done with malice, fraud, and oppression with conscious disregard for her rights and with the intent, design, and purpose of injuring her. Defendants, through their officers, managing agents, and/or supervisors, authorized, condoned and/or ratified the unlawful conduct of all of the other Defendants named in this Action. By reason thereof, Plaintiff is entitled to punitive or exemplary damages from all Defendants in a sum according to proof of at trial.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Pay Overtime Wages – Against all Defendants)

- 109. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth hereat.
- 110. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Plaintiff was an employee of Defendants covered by Labor Code sections 510 and 1194.
- At all times relevant to this Complaint, Labor Code section 510 provided that "[e]ight hours of labor constitutes a day's work." Moreover, at all times relevant to this Complaint, Labor Code section 510 provided that, "[a]ny work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of forty hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours 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."
- At all times relevant to this Complaint, Labor Code section 510 further provided that "[a]ny work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than

10

8

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

28

twice the regular rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an employee."

- 113. By requiring Plaintiff to work during shifts that consisted of more than eight (8) hours per day, more than forty (40) hour in a work week, or seven (7) days in a row in one workweek without receiving compensation for those hours at a rate of one-and-one-half times her regular rate of work, and requiring Plaintiff to work more than twelve (12) hours in one day or in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek without receiving compensation for those hours at a rate of no less than twice her regular rate of pay, a result of, including but not limited to, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all hours actually worked at the proper overtime rate of pay; detrimentally rounding time entries; detrimentally editing and/or manipulation of time entries; and engaging, suffering or permitting Plaintiff to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring Plaintiff to don and doff required work uniforms off the clock, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code section 1194.
- As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has been deprived of wages, including overtime and/or double time wages, in amounts to be determined at trial, and is entitled to recovery of such amounts, plus interest and penalties thereon, as well as attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections 1194 and 218.6, Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287.

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Pay Minimum Wages – Against all Defendants)

- 115. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth hereat.
- 116. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was an employee of Defendants covered by Labor Code section 1197 and applicable Wage Orders.
- 117. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1197 and applicable Wage ()rders, Plaintiff was entitled to receive minimum wages for all hours worked.
 - Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff minimum wages for all hours worked in violation 118.

of Labor Code section 1197 and applicable wage orders as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all hours actually worked; detrimentally rounding time entries; detrimentally editing and/or manipulation of time entries; and engaging, suffering, or permitting Plaintiff to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring Plaintiff to don and doff required work uniforms off the clock.

- 119. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff has suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent Plaintiff was not paid minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Defendants' control.
- 120. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 218.6, 1194, and 1194.2, Plaintiff is entitled to recover the full amount of unpaid minimum wages, prejudgment interest, liquidated damages, as well as attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections 1194 and 218.6, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287.

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Provide Meal Periods or Compensation in Lieu Thereof – Against all Defendants)

- 121. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth hereat.
- 122. Pursuant to Labor Code section 512, no employer shall employ an employee for a work period of more than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal break of not less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of all of his or her duties. The "first meal periods must start after no more than five hours." (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1042.)
- 123. Furthermore, pursuant to Labor Code section 512, no employer shall employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of all of his or her duties. The second meal period must begin "after no more than 10 hours of work in a day, i.e., no later than what would be the start of the 11th hour of work..." (Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. 1042.)
 - 124. Plaintiff was not provided with the requisite meal breaks as required under the law.

- 125. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7, if an employer fails to provide an employee with a timely meal period as provided in an applicable statute or Wage 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 work day that an uninterrupted timely meal period is not provided.
- 126. By failing to provide Plaintiff with the meal periods contemplated by California law, and by failing to provide compensation for such unprovided meal periods, as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code section 512 and applicable Wage Orders.
- 127. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff has been deprived of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's regular rate of compensation for each work day that an uninterrupted meal period was not provided, in amounts to be determined at trial, and is entitled to recovery of such amounts, plus interest and costs under Labor Code sections 226.7, Code of Civil Procedure section 1032, and Civil Code section 3287

THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Provide Rest Periods or Compensation in Lieu Thereof - Against all Defendants)

- 128. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- permit" employees to take ten (10) minute rest periods in about the middle of each four (4) hour work period "or major fraction thereof." Accordingly, employees who work shifts of three and-a-half (3 ½) to six (6) hours must be provided ten (10) minutes of paid rest period, employees who work shifts of more than six (6) and up to ten (10) hours must be provided with twenty (20) minutes of paid rest period, and employees who work shifts of more than ten (10) hours must be provided thirty (30) minutes of paid rest period.
- 130. Moreover, the Industrial Wage Orders require that the rest periods "insofar as practicable ... shall be in the middle of each work period." (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1032-1033, citing DLSE Opn. Letter No. 2001.09.17 (Sept. 17,

- 131. Plaintiff was not provided with requisite rest periods as contemplated under the
- 132. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7, if an employer fails to provide an employee with a rest period as provided in the applicable Wage 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 work day that the timely rest period is not provided.
- 133. By their failure to provide Plaintiff with timely rest periods contemplated by California law, and failing to provide compensation for such unprovided timely rest periods, as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders.
- 134. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff has been deprived of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's regular rate of compensation for each work day that an uninterrupted rest period was not provided, in amounts to be determined at trial, and is entitled to recovery of such amounts, plus interest and costs under Labor Code sections 226.7, Code of Civil Procedure section 1032, and Civil Code section 3287.

FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements – Against All Defendants)

- 135. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth hereat.
- 136. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), Plaintiff was entitled to receive, semi-monthly or at the time of each payment of wages, an accurate itemized statement showing gross wages earned, net wages earned, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.
- 137. Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff with itemized wage statements that accurately reflected, among other things: gross wages earned and paid; total hours worked by Plaintiff; net wages earned and paid; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; and other such information as required

Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff with accurate wage statements was

knowing and intentional. Defendants had the ability to provide Plaintiff with accurate wage

statements, but intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff with accurate wage statements.

by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

1

2

3

4

are paid in full or an action is commenced. The penalty cannot exceed 30 days of wages.

- 145. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff all wages earned and unpaid prior to her termination in accordance with Labor Code section 201, including, without limitation, as a consequence of, among other things, failing to pay all overtime wages, regular wages, meal break premiums, and rest break premiums owed.
- 146. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff all wages earned prior to her termination in accordance with Labor Code section 201 was willful. Defendants had the ability to pay all wages earned by Plaintiff at the time of termination in accordance with Labor Code section 201, but intentionally adopted policies or practices incompatible with the requirements of Labor Code section 201.
- 147. Pursuant to Labor Code section 203, Plaintiff is entitled to penalty wages from the date her earned and unpaid wages were due, upon termination, until paid, up to a maximum of 30 days.
- 148. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff has suffered damages in an amount subject to proof, to the extent she was not paid all waiting time penalties and penalty wages owed pursuant to Labor Code section 203.
- 149. As a consequence of Defendants' willful conduct in not paying wages owed upon her termination, Plaintiff is entitled to thirty (30) days wages as a penalty under Labor Code section 203, together with interest thereon and attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections 218.5 and 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, and Civil Code section 3287.

SIXTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Labor Code § 2802 – Against all Defendants)

- 150. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth hereat.
- 151. California Labor Code section 2802, subdivision (a) provides that "an 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 duties . . ."
 - 152. At all relevant times, Defendants required Plaintiff to incur expenses to perform job

duties by requiring Plaintiff to incur costs for, including but not limited to, costs incurred for driving her personal vehicle, including mileage and gas, separately laundering her mandatory work uniform, and the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans.

- 153. At all relevant times, Defendants failed and refused, and still fail and refuse, to reimburse Plaintiff for costs incurred for driving her personal vehicle, including mileage and gas, separately laundering her mandatory work uniform, and the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans.
- 154. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff has suffered damages in an amount subject to proof, to the extent Plaintiff was not reimbursed, for costs incurred for driving her personal vehicle, including mileage and gas, separately laundering her mandatory work uniform, and the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans.
- 155. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2802, Code of Civil Procedure section 1032, and Civil Code section 3287, Plaintiff is entitled to reimbursement for costs Plaintiff incurred for driving her personal vehicle, including mileage and gas, separately laundering her mandatory work uniform, and the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans, interest and penalties thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit.

SEVENTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Unfair Competition - Against all Defendants)

- 156. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth hereat.
- 157. The unlawful conduct of Defendants alleged herein constitutes unfair competition within the meaning of Business and Professions Code section 17200. Due to their unlawful business practices in violation of the Labor Code, Defendants have gained a competitive advantage over other comparable companies doing business in the State of California that comply with their obligations to compensate employees in accordance with the Labor Code.
- 158. Plaintiff is entitled to an injunction and other equitable relief against such unlawful practices in order to prevent future damage, for which there is no adequate remedy at law, and to avoid a multiplicity of lawsuits.

- 159. As a result of Defendants' unfair competition as alleged herein. Plaintiff has suffered injury in fact and lost money or property. Plaintiff has been deprived from not being compensated overtime, regular, and/or minimum wages, from not being provided with meal and rest breaks or compensation in lieu thereof, from being provided with accurate wage statements, and for not being indemnified for costs incurred in furtherance of her work duties.
- and each of them, Plaintiff is entitled to equitable and injunctive relief, including full restitution and/or disgorgement of all wages, overtime, and costs which have been unlawfully withheld from Plaintiff as a result of the business acts and practices described herein and enjoining Defendants to cease and desist from engaging in the practices described herein. Restitution of the money owed to Plaintiff is necessary to prevent Defendants from becoming unjustly enriched by their failure to comply with the Labor Code.
- Defendants will not continue such activity into the future. Plaintiff alleges that if Defendants, and each defendant constituting Defendants, is not enjoined from the conduct set forth in the Complaint, they will continue to fail to pay overtime, regular, and/or minimum wages, will continue fail to pay premium pay for missed meal and rest periods, will continue to fail to issue accurate wage statements, will continue to fail to reimburse for costs incurred in furtherance of work duties, and will continue to fail to pay appropriate taxes, and insurance, and unemployment withholdings.
- 162. Plaintiff is entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees in connection with her unfair competition claims pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5. the substantial benefit doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine. Plaintiff is entitled to costs of suit under Code of Civil Procedure section 1032 and interest under Civil Code sections 218.6 and 3287.

EIGHTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress – Against All Defendants)

Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

168. Plaintiff prays for a trial by jury.

The wrongful and unlawful practices and other misconduct set forth herein, committed by Defendants, and each of them, exceeded the normal risks of the employment relationship that Plaintiff had with Defendants. Defendants wrongfully, willfully and/or intentionally sought to inflict emotional distress upon Plaintiff through the conduct, actions and/or omissions described herein. As such, the subject conduct was so extreme and outrageous that it exceeded the boundaries of a decent society and lies outside the compensation bargain.

165. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, knew, must have known, should have known, or had reason to know that their conduct, as herein alleged, was substantially certain to inflict emotional distress upon Plaintiff. As such, Defendants' conduct was intentional, malicious and carried out with a deliberate, conscious and/or reckless disregard of the high degree of probability that such conduct would inflict extreme emotional distress upon Plaintiff. Additionally, the aforesaid conduct was also in direct violation of California law and public policy.

166. Therefore, as a direct, foreseeable, legal and proximate result of Defendants' intentional, willful, deliberate conduct, as herein alleged, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer loss of her reputation, shame, mortification, humiliation, embarrassment, severe mental and emotional distress and anguish, as well as severe anxiety, trepidation, apprehension, panic, dread, fear, worry, and hurt feelings all to her damage in an amount to be proven at trial. The acts, omissions and conduct of Defendants were, and continue to be, oppressive, deliberate, intentional, reprehensible, malicious and were carried out in conscious disregard of their probable outcome.

Defendants acted in a willful, deliberate and intentional manner, and their conduct was and continues to be despicable, malicious and outrageous in that it has caused and continues to cause Plaintiff to needlessly suffer cruel and unjust hardship. Thus, Defendants' conduct, actions and/or omissions, as herein set forth, justify an award of punitive damages in an amount sufficient to deter them from ever engaging in such conduct again in the future.

JURY TRIAL

4	O. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.								
1	O. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.								
3				BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.					
4	Bated. Becember 3, 2020		DID.	11	1 1				
5			211	h.A					
6			BY:	DAVID D. B					
7			Atto	ANTON SW rneys for	AIN-GIL Plaintiff	SUSIE	ANNETTE		
8			VAI	LENZUELA					
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									
24									
25									
26									
27									