1		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS W. FALV Thomas W. Falvey (SBN 65744) Michael H. Boyamian (SBN 256107) Armand R. Kizirian (SBN 293992) 550 North Brand Boulevard, Suite 1500 Glendale, California 91203-1922 Telephone: 818.547.5200 Facsimile: 818.500.9307 E-mail(s): thomaswfalvey@gmail.com mike.falveylaw@gmail.com armand.falveylaw@gmail.com armand.falveylaw@gmail.com Sasoon Sardarian (SBN 235088) George K. Jawlakian (SBN 296692) 140 South Lake Avenue, Suite 351 Pasadena, California 91101 Telephone: 626.421.6571 Facsimile: 626.421.6702 E-mail(s): SS@sardarianlaw.com GJ@sardarianlaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff KIRKLAND OARD On Behalf Of All Others Similarly Situated	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT NOV 3 2015 BY JASMIN CASILLAS, DEPUTY IAN
12		and
13 14	·	OR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
15	·	OF SAN BERNARDINO
16	KIRKLAND OARD, on behalf of	CASE NO.CIVDS1516106
17	himself and all others similarly situated,	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:
18	Plaintiff,	1. FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES FOR ALL HOURS WORKED
19	vs.	2. FAILURE TO PAY WAGES AT THE AGREED RATE
20	DAILY PRESS, LLC, a California	3. FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME COMPENSATION
21	corporation; LOCAL MEDIA GROUP, INC., a Delaware corporation; and	4. FAILURE TO PROVIDE AND PAY FOR MEAL PERIODS
22	DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,	5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE AND PAY FOR REST PERIODS
23.	Defendants.	6. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS
24	. Detendants.	7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE FOR REASONABLE BUSINESS EXPENSES
25		8. UNLAWFUL WITHHOLDING OF WAGES DUE O WICH A THOM OF THE CALLEDDNIA UNEAR
26		9. VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW
27		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
28		B9 FAX

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff KIRKLAND OARD, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby files this Complaint against Defendants DAILY PRESS, LLC., a California corporation, LOCAL MEDIA GROUP, INC., a Delaware corporation, and DOES 1 through 10 (hereinafter collectively, "Defendants" or "Daily Press"). Plaintiff is informed and believes and on the basis of that information and belief alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- 1. This matter is brought as a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382, on behalf of Plaintiff and all others similarly situated Newspaper Carrier employees currently and formerly employed by Defendants to recover unpaid wages and penalties for Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code and applicable California Wage Orders. Newspaper Carriers, who perform substantial work in preparing, assembling, and distributing Defendants' newspapers to its subscribers, are improperly and unlawfully categorized as independent contractors when they, in economic reality, are employees (hereinafter referred to as "Newspaper Carriers" or "Plaintiff Class Members"). Class-wide relief which results from this improper categorization is set forth hereafter.
- 2. Defendants are estopped from asserting the statute of limitations as a defense because the Newspaper Carriers were prevented from discovering the facts concerning Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code and Wage Order, described above, because of the intentional concealment of those facts by Defendants.
- 3. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the putative class, seeks relief for Defendants' unlawful employment policies, practices and procedures, which have resulted in the failure of Defendants to pay Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class all wages due to them, including, failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked (Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197); failing to pay in accordance with the designated wage scale (Labor Code §§ 221, 223.); breaching the duty to provide off-duty meal periods (Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 516); failing to pay for overtime hours worked (Labor Code §§ 204, 223, 510, 1194, 1198); failing to provide rest and meal periods (Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 516); failing to timely furnish accurate, itemized wage statements (Labor Code § 226.); failing to reimburse all expenses and losses incurred by them in

discharging their duties (Labor Code § 2802); unlawfully deducting from the wages earned and due from Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class (Labor Code § 221), and for violations of the California Unfair Competition Law (Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq.).

- 4. In this action Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the members of the Plaintiff Class seeks general, liquidated, and punitive damages; injunctive relief, restitution, and other equitable relief, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs from Defendants.
- 5. The acts complained of herein have occurred, are presently occurring, and are expected to continue occurring, within the time period from four (4) years preceding the filing of the original Complaint herein, up to and through the time of trial for this matter (hereinafter, the "Relevant Time Period").

PARTIES

Plaintiff Kirkland Oard

6. Plaintiff Kirkland Oard is an individual over the age of eighteen (18) and is now and/or at all relevant times mentioned in this Complaint was a resident and domiciliary of the State of California. Throughout the Relevant Time Period, Mr. Oard has worked for Defendants as a Newspaper Carrier out of Defendants' warehouse facility in Victorville, California.

Defendants Daily Press, LLC, and Local Media Group, Inc.

7. Defendants are newspaper Defendants of general circulation operating primarily in the county of San Bernardino area of Southern California. Upon information and belief, Daily Press, LLC owns and operates The Daily Press in Victorville, California and the Desert Dispatch in Barstow, California. During the Relevant Time Period, Defendants employed numerous individuals to distribute copies of their newspaper and other products to Defendants' subscribers. Local Media Group, Inc. is the entity appearing on documents resembling Plaintiff's supposed wage statements.

Defendants Does 1 through 10, Inclusive

8. DOES 1 through 10 inclusive are now and/or at all times mentioned in this Complaint were, licensed to do business and/or actually doing business in the State of California. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or corporate, of DOES 1 through 10, inclusive and for that reason, DOES 1 through 10 are sued under such fictitious names pursuant

to California Code of Civil Procedure, section 474. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to allege such names and capacities as soon as they are ascertained. DOES 1 through 5 are believed to be business entities who were also co-employers of the Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class herein.

All Defendants

- 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that at all times herein mentioned, all Defendants, and each of them, were and are the agents, servants, employees, joint venturers, and/or partners of each of the other Defendants, and were, at all such times, acting within the course and scope of said employment and/or agency; furthermore, that each and every Defendant herein, while acting as a high corporate officer, director and/or managing agent, principal and/or employer, expressly directed, consented to, approved, affirmed and ratified each and every action taken by the other co-Defendants, as herein alleged and was responsible in whole or in part for the matters referred to herein.
- 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that at all times herein mentioned, all Defendants, and each of them, were and are the agents, servants, employees, joint venturers, and/or partners of each of the other Defendants, and were, at all such times, acting within the course and scope of said employment and/or agency; furthermore, that each and every Defendant herein, while acting as a high corporate officer, director and/or managing agent, principal and/or employer, expressly directed, consented to, approved, affirmed and ratified each and every action taken by the other co-Defendants, as herein alleged and was responsible in whole or in part for the matters referred to herein.
- 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that at all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, proximately caused Plaintiff, all others similarly situated and the general public to be subjected to the unlawful practices, wrongs, complaints, injuries and/or damages alleged in this Complaint.
- 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are now and/or at all times mentioned in this Complaint were members of and/or engaged in a joint venture, partnership and common enterprise, and were acting within the course and scope of,

and in pursuit of said joint venture, partnership and common enterprise and, as such were coemployers of the Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class herein.

13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, at all times mentioned in this Complaint, concurred with, contributed to, approved of, aided and abetted, condoned and/or otherwise ratified, the various acts and omissions of each and every one of the other Defendants in proximately causing the injuries and/or damages alleged in this Complaint.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 14. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction in the matter because the claims exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this court and Plaintiff and Defendants are both residents of the State of California. Further, the issues herein are based on California Statutes and law including the California Labor Code and the California Unfair Competition Law.
- 15. Venue is proper in the County of San Bernardino because Defendants transact substantial business in this County, Plaintiff's claims arose in this County and because Defendants maintain and operate a distribution warehouse location in Victorville, California in the County of San Bernardino where Plaintiff and others similarly situated worked in performing services for Defendants.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 16. Defendants are a newspaper company of general circulation operating primarily in the county of San Bernardino area of Southern California. Most customers of Defendants' business receive home delivery of newspapers on a daily basis which are printed and distributed under the auspices of the Daily Press doing business as the Desert Dispatch or The Daily Press.
- 17. Defendants organize the distribution of their newspapers that they write and publish by maintaining common distribution facilities located in San Bernardino County and elsewhere.

 Newspaper Carriers, including Mr. Oard, perform significant work on sites owned and controlled by the Defendants, including but not limited to folding and providing inserts, sections, pre-prints, samples, bags, and supplements as well as other products provided by Daily Press at warehouses and common distribution facilities owned by Defendants. Newspaper Carriers, including Mr. Oard, are

then instructed by Defendants to deliver and distribute the Defendants' newspapers to their subscribers.

- 18. Defendants exercise and have exercised complete control over the Newspaper Carriers' performance of their duties. Defendants utilize a turn-by-turn guide to direct Newspaper Carriers, including Mr. Oard, on exactly how and when to deliver newspapers. Defendants review, supervise, and respond to complaints. Sometimes they do so by taking action against the carriers, through a computer system that monitors the behavior, timing, and manner of delivery of newspapers which may lead to illegal deductions from Newspaper Carriers' payment schedule.
- 19. Defendants commit further illegal deductions for customer complaints, for rubber bands and bags required by Defendants as necessary for the performance of Newspaper Carriers' duties, and for supposed "loss" of excess newspapers.
- 20. The Defendants also penalize Newspaper Carriers for customer complaints by terminating employment relationships of Newspaper Carriers.
- 21. Defendants also collect monetary tips from customers intended for the delivery service Newspaper Carriers provide, yet Defendants do not distribute it to Newspaper Carriers or withhold a portion of the full amount.
- 22. Other than using their personal vehicles, there is a lack of investment in independent equipment by the Newspaper Carriers, including that of Mr. Oard. A relatively low degree of skill is required to perform duties. Newspaper Carriers, including Mr. Oard, perform an integral part of the operation of Defendants' writing, printing, and distribution of newspapers.
- 23. The economic realities of Class Members' relationship with Defendants establishes that Class Members, under conventional, legal, and economic tests, are now and have been employees of Defendants and not independent contractors.
- 24. Because Newspaper Carriers are employees, not independent contractors, numerous California Labor Code violations have occurred or are occurring on an ongoing basis, including failure to provide overtime, meal breaks, rest breaks, proper payroll withholding treatment, and the other protections of Labor Code § 2802 and Labor Code § 221, all of which they are entitled to as valid, non-exempt employees under California law.

9

10

13

17 18

16

19 20

21 22

2324

25

26 27

28

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

- 25. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above.
- 26. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated. The class which Plaintiff seeks to represent is composed of and defines as follows:
 - a. <u>Plaintiff Class</u>: All of Defendants' California-based carriers who performed newspaper delivery services for Defendants and their subscribers during the Relevant Time Period.
- 27. <u>Numerosity</u>: Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all members is impracticable. While the exact number and identification of class members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through appropriate discovery directed to Defendants, Plaintiff is informed and believes that the class includes at least forty members.
- 28. Questions of Law and Fact Common to the Class: Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the class. These common legal and factual questions, which do not vary from class member to class member, and which may be determined without reference to the individual circumstances of any class member, include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - a. Whether Defendants require each member of the Plaintiff Class to execute a preprinted document captioned "Independent Contractor Distribution Agreement";
 - b. Whether Defendants required, encouraged, suffered, or permitted Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class to perform a significant percentage of their duties at a warehouse prior to distribution, including handling Defendants-provided inserts, samples, sections, and other products provided by the Defendants;
 - c. Whether Defendants train and instruct on how to deliver the newspapers including directions by a turn-by-turn guide. Presently this guide actually directs Newspaper
 Carriers on exactly how to execute their duties including driving directions;

- d. Whether Defendants review, supervise, punish complaints through a computer system or some other method or equipment that monitors the behavior and the time and manner of delivery of the newspapers;
- e. Whether Defendants deduct or withhold money from Newspaper Carriers for customer complaints, rubber bands, bags, and/or "loss" of excess newspapers;
- f. Whether Plaintiff and Newspaper Carriers do not enjoy any profit upside in connection with their duties and collectively have periodic deductions from their payment schedule;
- g. Whether the relationship between Newspaper Carriers, including Plaintiff, and the Defendants is relatively permanent with many members of the Plaintiff Class working between three to ten years;
- h. Whether the delivery of newspapers by a newspaper of general circulation is a critical and integral part of the business;
- i. Whether the monetary tips intended for Newspaper Carriers and provided by
 Defendants' customers to Defendants is actually and fully given to class members;
- j. Whether the degree of skill is relatively low;
- k. Whether or not Newspaper Carriers are properly categorized as independent contractors:
- l. Whether all benefits and protections of the California Labor Code apply to Plaintiff when properly characterized as a non-exempt employee;
- m. Whether each Newspaper Carrier is entitled to the remedial relief in the form of compensation for violations of the Labor Code as set forth hereinafter;
- n. Whether the Newspaper Carriers are entitled to damages, penalties, interest, and attorneys' fees and costs, as provided by the Labor Code and Wage 1-2001;
- o. Whether the Newspaper Carriers are entitled to injunctive relief to enjoin further violations of the Labor Code and Wage Order 1-2001.
- p. Whether Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class are entitled to overtime compensation;

- q. Whether Defendants failed to pay overtime compensation to Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class;
- r. Whether Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class are entitled to meal and rest periods;
- s. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to provide, and/or compensate Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class for meal and rest breaks;
- t. Whether Defendants' policy and practice of not providing, and/or compensating Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class for meal and rest breaks violated California wage and hour law;
- whether Defendants unlawfully and/or willfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class with true and proper wage statements upon payment of wages, in violation of Labor Code section 226;
- v. Whether Defendants' conduct as alleged herein violates the Unfair Business Practices

 Act of California, Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq.
- 29. Typicality: Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the claims of the named Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the members of the Plaintiff Class. Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class performed identical duties for Defendants and were misclassified as independent contractors rather than properly classified as employees. As such, Plaintiff and all members of the Plaintiff Class sustained losses, injuries and damages arising from Defendants' common policies, practices, procedures, protocols, routines, and rules which were applied to other members of the Plaintiff Class as well as Plaintiff. Plaintiff seeks recovery for the same type of losses, injuries, and damages as were suffered by other members of the Plaintiff Class.
- 30. Adequacy of Representation: Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the class because he is a member of the Plaintiff Class and his interests do not conflict with the interests of the members he seeks to represent. Plaintiff has retained competent counsel, experienced in the prosecution of complex class actions, and together Plaintiff and his counsel intend to prosecute this action vigorously for the benefit of the class. The interests of the class members will fairly and adequately be protected by Plaintiff and his

attorneys.

- 31. Superiority: Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation since individual litigation of the claims of all class members is impracticable. It would be unduly burdensome to the courts if these matters were to proceed on an individual basis, because this would potentially result in hundreds of individual, repetitive lawsuits. Individual litigation presents the potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments, and the prospect of a "race to the courthouse," and an inequitable allocation of recovery among those with equally meritorious claims. By contrast, the class action device presents far fewer management difficulties and provides the benefit of a single adjudication, economics of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court.
- 32. The various claims asserted in this action are additionally or alternatively certifiable under the provisions of the California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 because:
 - a. The prosecution of separate actions by hundreds of individual class members would create a risk or varying adjudications with respect to individual class members, thus establishing incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants, and
 - b. The prosecution of separate actions by individual class members would also create the risk of adjudications with respect to them that, as a practical matter, would be dispositive of the interest of the other class members who are not a party to such adjudications and would substantially impair or impede the ability of such non-party class members to protect their interests.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES FOR ALL HOURS WORKED

- 33. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above.
- 34. Labor Code Section 1194 provides that an employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit.

- 35. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 1197, payment of less than the minimum wage fixed by the Labor Commission is unlawful.
- 36. Wage Order No. 1-2001 states, "(A) Every employer shall pay to each employee wages not less than nine dollars (\$9.00) per hour for all hours worked, effective July 1, 2014, and not less than ten dollars (\$10.00) per hour for all hours worked, effective January 1, 2016, except:

 LEARNERS. Employees during their first 160 hours of employment in occupations, in which they have no previous similar or related experience, may be paid not less than 85 percent of the minimum wage rounded to the nearest nickel. (B) Every employer shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, not less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period, whether the remuneration is measured by time, piece, commission, or otherwise."
- 37. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 1198, it is unlawful to employ persons for longer than the hours set by the Industrial Welfare Commission, or under conditions prohibited by the applicable Wage Orders, including but not limited to, failing to keep records of and failing to correctly report hours worked.
- 38. Labor Code Section 1174 requires that every person employing labor in this accurate state shall keep (1) a record showing the names and addresses of all employees employed and the ages of all minors; (2) at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments; (3) such records in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, on file for not less than three years. This statute also prevents an employer from prohibiting an employee from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units earned. Defendants have willfully failed to keep the records required by Section 1174.
- 39. Throughout the Relevant Time Period, Defendants' hourly compensation scheme purported to compensate Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class for all hours worked. In reality, Defendants suffered or permitted Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class to

work portions of their day without compensation, while subject to Defendants' control, which resulted in the Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class earning less than the legal minimum wage in the State of California.

- 40. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants have willfully failed to keep the records required by Section 1174. By failing to maintain adequate time records as required by Labor Code section 1174(d) and IWC Wage Order, number 9, section 7(A), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the minimum wage compensation due Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class.
- 41. Defendants owe Plaintiff, and the other members of the Plaintiff Class, minimum wages and liquidated damages pursuant to Labor Code sections 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2 and 1197, IWC Wage Order, number 9, section 4 due in amounts to be determined at trial during the three (3) years prior to the filing of the initial Complaint in this action.
- 42. Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class request payment of unpaid minimum wages due in amounts to be determined at trial, interest, attorneys' fees and costs, against Defendants in a sum as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes.
 - 43. Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class also request relief as described below.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY WAGES AT THE AGREED RATE

- 44. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above.
- 45. Labor Code Section 223 provides, "Where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage designated by statute or contract."
- 46. Throughout the Relevant Time Period, Defendants' compensation scheme purported to compensate Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class for all hours worked. In reality, Defendants suffered or permitted Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class to work portions of their day without compensation, while subject to Defendants' control, which resulted in the Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class earning less than the designated rate.

- 47. Also throughout the Relevant Time Period, Defendants paid less than the agreed upon compensation owed to Plaintiff and the other members of the putative class, while purporting to pay the designated wage scale. As a result, Defendants' conduct violates Labor Code Section 223.
- 48. Defendants owed and still owe Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class wages at the designated rate pursuant to the Labor Code in amounts to be determined at trial for the hours worked during the relevant time period.
- 49. Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class request payment of unpaid wages at the designated rate in amounts to be determined at trial, plus interest, attorneys' fees and costs, against Defendants in a sum as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes.
 - 50. Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class also request relief as described below.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME COMPENSATION

- 51. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above.
- 52. Labor Code Section 1194 provides that an employee receiving less than the legal overtime compensation is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit.
- 53. Labor Code Section 510(a) states: "Any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours 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." Labor Code Section 510(a) further states: "Any work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee." Labor Code Section 510(a) further states: "[A]ny 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."
- 54. Throughout the Relevant Time Period, Wage Order No. 1-2001 provided for payment of overtime wages equal to one and one-half (1-1/2) times an employee's regular rate of pay for all

hours worked over eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or for payment of overtime wages equal to double the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in any workday and/or for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh (7th) day of work in any one workweek.

- 55. Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class do not satisfy any of the exemptions from the overtime requirements of the Labor Code, or the Wage Order.
- 56. Throughout the Relevant Time Period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class overtime wages based upon all hours worked, based on Defendants' uniform policies, practices and procedures.
- 57. Defendants' pattern, practice and uniform administration of corporate policy regarding illegal employee compensation as described herein is unlawful and creates an entitlement, pursuant to Labor Code Section1194(a), to recovery by Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class, in a civil action, for the unpaid balance of the full amount of the straight time compensation and overtime premiums owing, including interest thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit.
- 58. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194(a) and California Civil Code Section 3287(b), Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class seek recovery of pre-judgment interest on all amounts recovered herein.
- 59. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194, Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class request that the Court award reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred by them in this action.
 - 60. Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class also request relief as described below.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE AND PAY FOR MEAL PERIODS

(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class Against All Defendants)

- 61. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above.
- 62. Labor Code Section 226.7(a) provides that "No employer shall require any employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission."

////

- 63. Labor Code Section 512 provides that "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."
- 64. Labor Code Section 512 further provides that "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."
- 65. Labor Code Section 516 provides that the Industrial Welfare Commission may adopt or amend working condition orders with respect to meal periods for any workers in California consistent with the health and welfare of those workers.
- 66. Section 11(C) of Wage Order No. 1-2001 provides that "Unless the employee is relieved of all duty during a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. An "on duty" meal period shall be permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved of all duty and when by written agreement between the parties an on-the-job paid meal period is agreed to."
- 67. Section 11(D) of Wage Order No. 1-2001 provides that "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."
- 68. Throughout the Relevant Time Period Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class consistently worked over five (5) hours per work period, and therefore, were entitled to a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to exceeding five (5) hours of employment.
- 69. Throughout the Relevant Time Period Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class consistently worked over ten (10) hours per work period, and therefore, were entitled to a second meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

- 70. Throughout the Relevant Time Period Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class did not waive their meal periods, by mutual consent with Defendants or otherwise.
- 71. Throughout the Relevant Time Period Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class did not enter into any written agreement with Defendants agreeing to an on-the-job paid meal period.
- 72. The Defendants implemented a uniform policy and procedure in which Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class were not provided required meal periods.
- 73. Defendants failed to comply with the required meal periods established by Labor Code Section 226.7, Labor Code Section 512, Labor Code Section 516 and the applicable Wage Order.
- 74. Pursuant to Section 11 of Wage Order No. 1-2001, and Labor Code Section 226.7(b) (which requires, in the event that "an employer fails to provide an employee a meal or rest period in accordance with an applicable 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 meal or rest period is not provided"), Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one (1) hour of wages per missed meal period, in a sum to be proven at trial.
- 75. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194(a), Civil Code Section 3287(b), Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class seek recovery of pre-judgment interest on all amounts recovered herein.
- 76. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194, the members of the Plaintiff Class request that the Court award reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred by them in this action.
 - 77. Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class also request relief as described below.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE AND PAY FOR REST BREAKS

(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class Against All Defendants)

78. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above.

////

| | ////

- Labor Code Section 226.7(a) provides that "No employer shall require any employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare
- Labor Code Section 516 provides that the Industrial Welfare Commission may adopt or amend working condition orders with respect to rest periods for any workers in California
- IWC Wage Order, number 1-2001, section 12 required employers to authorize. permit, and provide a ten (10) minute paid rest for each three and a half (3-1/2) hours of work,
- At all times relevant hereto, Labor Code Section 226.7(b) and IWC Wage Order, number 1-2001, section 12 required employers to pay one hour of additional pay at the regular rate of compensation for each employee and each workday that a proper rest period is not provided.
- Throughout the Relevant Time Period, Defendant implemented a uniform policy and procedure in which Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class were not provided required rest
 - As a result, throughout the Relevant Time Period, Defendants regularly:
 - a. Failed to provide paid rest periods of ten (10) minutes during which Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class were relieved of all duty for each three-and-a-
 - b. Failed to compensate Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class for break time
 - c. Failed to pay Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not
 - Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class also request relief as described below.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

- 86. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above.
- 87. Labor Code Section 226(a) requires every employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, to furnish each of its employees, either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately when wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing, among other things, (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, (5) net wages earned and (6) all applicable hourly rates in effect during each respective pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by each respective individual.
- 88. As a matter of pattern and practice, in violation of Labor Code Section 226, including but not limited to Labor Code Section 226(a), Defendants did not maintain accurate records pertaining to Plaintiff or the members of the Plaintiff Class, including, but not limited to, when they began and ended each work period, meal period, rest period, the total daily hours worked, the total hours worked per pay period and applicable rates of pay.
- 89. Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class were harmed by Defendants' failure to provide the required information. Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code Section 226(a) hindered Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class from determining the amount of wages, overtime, and other compensation actually owed to them, and damaged them in the amount of the unpaid wages, compensation, and overtime wages that were not reported by Defendants, as required.
- 90. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 226(e), Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class are entitled to penalties as follows:
 - a. Fifty dollars (\$50.00) per employee for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs; and
 - b. One hundred dollars (\$100.00) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period.

- 91. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 226(g), Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class are entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.
 - 92. Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class also request relief as described below.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO REIMBURSE FOR REASONABLE BUSINESS EXPENSES (On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class Against All Defendants)

- 93. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above.
- 94. California Labor Code Section 2802(a) provides in pertinent part:

 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 or her duties, or of his
 or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though
 unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the
 directions, believed them to be unlawful.

Wage Order 1-2001, Section 8, provides that "No employer shall make any deduction from the wage or require any reimbursement from an employee for any cash shortage, breakage, or loss of equipment, unless it can be shown that the shortage, breakage, or loss is caused by a dishonest or willful act, or by the gross negligence of the employee."

- 95. During the relevant Time Period Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class incurred necessary expenditures and losses in direct consequence of the discharge of their employment duties and their obedience to the directions of Defendant, as follows:
 - (a) Plaintiff and Newspaper Carriers were required by Defendants to provide their own vehicles in order to deliver Defendants' newspapers, and in connection with provision of their own vehicles and the delivery of Defendants' newspapers, Plaintiff and Class Members necessarily incurred expenditures for gasoline, maintenance, and insurance. As well, they incurred losses associated with wear and tear to their vehicles. On information and belief, none of these expenditures or losses were reimbursed by Defendants to Plaintiff and Class Members.

- (b) Defendants routinely made deductions from Plaintiff's and Plaintiff Class
 Members' wages for each alleged complaint it received from its customers for,
 among other things, poor service, damaged papers, wet papers, and allegedly
 undelivered papers. Plaintiff, for example, was charged \$3.00 per complaint.
 Even though most, if not all, of these complained-of damages and losses were
 beyond the employee's control, or due to the simple negligence of the employee,
 Defendants nevertheless wrongfully and willfully made deductions from the
 Plaintiff's and Class Members' wages. Defendants made said deductions as part
 of a wrongful attempt to make Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class
 insurers of the Defendants' merchandise, which purpose is prohibited by
 California law. Said deductions were made by Defendants as part of a deliberate
 subterfuge that was designed, constructed, implemented and administered to
 circumvent the clear prohibitions of California case law and IWC Wage Order 12001 (8 C.C.R. §11010).
- (c) Defendants routinely required Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class to pay for rubber bands to tie the newspapers for delivery. Defendants also required Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class to purchase plastic bags used to hold newspapers together and to protect the newspapers in inclement weather. Defendants routinely made deductions for the rubber bands and plastic bags from the wages of Plaintiff and Class Members in contravention of IWC Wage Order No. 1-2001 §9(B) (8 C.C.R. §11010).
- (d) Defendants routinely provided Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class with newspapers in excess of the number that was needed to complete their respective delivery routes, and then Defendants routinely made deductions from the Plaintiff's and members of the Plaintiff Class' wages for each and every extra newspaper. These deductions were made even though the extra newspapers were given to Plaintiff and Newspaper Carriers by Defendants as a result of its own mistake. These deductions were made regardless of whether Plaintiff and

members of the Plaintiff Class returned the extra newspapers to Defendants. Defendants made said deductions as part of a wrongful attempt to make Plaintiff and Newspaper Carriers insurers of the Defendants' merchandise, which purpose is prohibited by California law. Said deductions were made by Defendants as part of a deliberate subterfuge that was designed, constructed, implemented and administered to circumvent the clear prohibitions of California case law and IWC Wage Order 1-2001 (8 C.C.R. §11010), which provides that no employer shall make any deduction from the wages of an employee for any loss of or damage to equipment, unless it can be shown that the loss or damage was caused by a dishonest or willful act, or by the gross negligence, of the employee.

96. Plaintiff is informed and believes that pursuant to California Code §2802 and Wage Order 1-2001, Section 8, Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class are entitled to recover their unreimbursed expenditures and losses, interest, and attorneys' fees and costs, in amounts to be proven at the time of trial. Further, with regard to all deductions described herein, which are all violative of IWC Wage Order 1-2001, Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class are entitled to recover penalties of \$100 for the initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation for every pay period in which Defendants made said illegal deductions from the wages of Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNLAWFUL WITHHOLDING OF WAGES DUE

- 97. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above.
- 98. The illegal deductions charged by Defendants against the wages of the Plaintiff and Newspaper Carriers, as described in the Seventh Cause of Action, supra, constituted a device utilized by Defendant to pay Plaintiff and members of Plaintiff Class less than their stated wages. Those illegal deductions include: (1) deductions made for customer complaints about alleged damages not caused by a dishonest or willful act or by the gross negligence of Plaintiff and Newspaper Carriers; (2) deductions made for rubber bands and bags, among other things, required by the Defendants as

necessary to the performance of the Plaintiff's and Newspaper Carriers' duties; (3) deductions made for the cost of workers compensation insurance; (4) failure by Defendants to direct all or some of the earned tips Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class receive from Defendants' subscribers; (5) deductions made for "loss" of excess newspapers, which loss was not caused by a dishonest or willful act or by the gross negligence of Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class.

99. Said illegal deductions amounted to an unlawful withholding of wages due to Plaintiff and Newspaper Carriers and constituted a violation of Labor Code § 221 by Defendants. As a proximate result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class have been damaged in an amount according to proof at the time of trial. Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class are entitled to recover penalties of \$100 for the initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation for every pay period in which Defendants made said illegal withholdings from the wages of Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class. Under Labor Code §218.5, Plaintiff and members from the Plaintiff Class are further entitled to recover their attorneys' fees and costs, in an amount to be proven at the time of trial.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW (On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class Against All Defendants)

- 100. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above.
- 101. Within the four years prior to the filing of the initial Complaint in this case,

 Defendants, and each of them, committed acts of unfair competition as defined by California

 Business and Professions Code section 17200, et. seq., by engaging in the following unlawful, unfair
 and fraudulent business acts and practices in the State of California, among others:
 - a. Misclassifying Newspaper Carriers as independent contractors and its unlawful failure to pay minimum, regular and overtime wages;
 - Requiring, encouraging, suffering, and/or permitting Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class to perform certain work-related duties without compensation equal to at least the California minimum wage;
 - c. Requiring, encouraging, suffering, and/or permitting Plaintiff and the members of the

Plaintiff Class to perform certain work-related duties without compensation at the
designated rate;

- d. Failing to pay Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class overtime compensation to which they were entitled;
- e. Failing to provide and/or compensate Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class for meal and rest periods;
- f. Unlawfully and/or willfully failing to provide Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class with true and proper wage statements upon payment of wages, in violation of Labor Code section 226;
- g. Unlawfully and/or willfully deducting wages from Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class for alleged customer complaints, "loss" of excess newspapers, among other things;
- h. Failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class for reasonably incurred business expenses.
- 102. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful, unfair, and/or fraudulent acts and practices described herein, Defendants have received and continue to hold ill-gotten gains belonging to Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful business practices, Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class have suffered economic injuries including, but not limited to, loss of wage compensation and compensation for missed meal and rest periods.
- 103. Through Defendants' use of such unlawful, unfair, and/or fraudulent acts and practices, Defendants have gained an unfair advantage over Defendants' competitors.
- 104. Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class seek full restitution on account of the economic injuries they have suffered, along with disgorgement of ill-gotten gains from Defendants as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired and/or converted by Defendants by means of the unlawful, unfair and fraudulent business practices complained of herein.

////

- 105. Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class seek appointment of a receiver, as necessary, to oversee said restitution, including all wages earned and unpaid, including interest thereon.
- fraudulent conduct described above, Defendants will continue unabated in their conduct, which will result in continued irreparable injury to members of the public, including, but not limited to the other members of the Plaintiff Class who currently work for Defendants, and for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Thus, Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class request that the Court issue a preliminary and permanent injunction prohibiting Defendants from engaging in the foregoing conduct.
 - 107. Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class also request relief as described below.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and on behalf of the members of the Plaintiff Class, prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

- a. For an order certifying the Plaintiff Class herein, appointing the named Plaintiff as the class representative of all others similarly situated and appointing counsel for the named Plaintiff as counsel for members of the class;
- b. An order awarding Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class all wages owed, all meal and rest break premiums owed, plus all penalties and compensatory damages in an amount according to proof with interest thereon;
- c. For reimbursement of work related expenses (Lab. Code § 2802);
- d. For economic and/or special damages, and/or liquidated damages in an amount according to proof with interest thereon;
- e. Civil penalties, according to proof;
- f. An order requiring imposition of a constructive trust and/or disgorgement of

 Defendants' ill-gotten gains to pay restitution to the Plaintiff and the members of
 the Plaintiff Class and to restore to the Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff

 Class all funds acquired by means of any act or practice declared by this Court to be

1		
1	an unlawful, fraudulent or unfair business act or practice, a violation of laws,	
2	statutes or regulations, or constituting unfair competition;	
3	g. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;	
4	h. For an award of attorneys' fees and costs incurred in the investigation, filing and	
5	prosecution of this action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5,	
6	Business and Profession Code Section 17200, et seq., Labor Code section 1194,	
7	and any other applicable provision of law;	
8	i. The Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class reserve the right to any benefits to which they	
9	may be entitled to under law and a finding of employment status without	
10	reservation; and	
11	j. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem necessary or appropriate.	
12	DATED N. 1 0 0015 TANIOPPIOES OF THOMAS W. FALVEY	
13	DATED: November 2, 2015 LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS W. FALVEY LAW OFFICES OF SASOON SARDARIAN	
14	\mathcal{M}	
15	By: Michael H. Boyamian	
16	Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class	
17,	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	
18	Plaintiff demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.	
19		
20	DATED: November 2, 2015 LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS W. FALVEY LAW OFFICES OF SASOON SARDARIAN	
21	\mathcal{M}	
22	By: Michael H. Boyamian	
1	Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class	
23		
24		
25		
26	·	
27		
28,		
	25	