



22726869

**FILED**  
**ALAMEDA COUNTY**

JUL 10 2023

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

*[Signature]*  
Deputy

1 Scott Edward Cole, Esq. (S.B. #160744)  
2 Laura Grace Van Note, Esq. (S.B. #310160)  
3 **SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC**  
4 555 12<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1725  
5 Oakland, California 94607  
6 Telephone: (510) 891-9800  
7 Facsimile: (510) 891-7030  
8 Email: scole@scalaw.com  
9 Email: lvannote@scalaw.com  
10 Web: www.scalaw.com

11 Attorneys for Representative Plaintiff  
12 and the Plaintiff Class

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

15 NICOLE RICHINA individually, and on  
16 behalf of all others similarly situated,

17 Plaintiff,

18 vs.

19 GOLDEN GATE RESTAURANT GROUP,  
20 INC. d.b.a. BURGER KING, and DOES 1  
21 through 100, inclusive,

22 Defendants.

Case No. **RG20067 470**

**CLASS ACTION**

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

**[JURY TRIAL DEMANDED]**

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
555 12<sup>TH</sup> STREET, SUITE 1725  
OAKLAND, CA 94607  
TEL.: (510) 891-9800

23 Representative Plaintiff alleges as follows:

24 **INTRODUCTION**

25 1. This is a class action seeking unpaid compensation for wages, meal and/or rest  
26 period violations, interest thereon, liquidated damages and other penalties, injunctive and other  
27 equitable relief, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under, *inter alia*, California Labor Code  
28 §§ 200-204, 218, *et seq.*, 226, *et seq.*, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, *et seq.*, 1197,  
1197.1, 1198, California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* and California Code of  
Civil Procedure § 1021.5.



1           2.       Plaintiff Nicole Richina (“Representative Plaintiff” or “Plaintiff”) brings this  
2 action individually and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated (“Class Members” and/or  
3 the “Plaintiff Class”) who are or have been employed by defendant Golden Gate Restaurant Group,  
4 Inc. d.b.a. Burger King and/or Does 1 through 100, inclusive (collectively “Defendants”) as non-  
5 exempt restaurant employees within the State of California within the applicable class period.

6           3.       The class period begins on July 10, 2016 and extends through trial, based upon the  
7 allegation that the violations of California’s wage and hour laws, as described more fully below,  
8 have been and are ongoing throughout that time.

9           4.       During the class period, Defendants have had a consistent policy of (1) unlawfully  
10 denying Class Members statutorily-mandated meal and rest periods, (2) willfully failing to provide  
11 Class Members with accurate semimonthly itemized wage statements reflecting the total number  
12 of hours each worked, the applicable deductions, and the applicable hourly rates in effect during  
13 the pay period, and (3) willfully failing to pay compensation in a prompt and timely manner to  
14 those Class Members whose employment with Defendants has terminated.

15           5.       Defendants operate a chain of Burger King restaurants within California for which  
16 Representative Plaintiff worked as a foodservice worker. The Representative Plaintiff is informed  
17 and believes and, on that basis, alleges that, within the class period, Defendants employed scores,  
18 if not hundreds, of individuals in California to perform these services, employment positions which  
19 did not, and currently do not, meet any known test for exemption from the payment of overtime  
20 wages and/or the entitlement to meal or rest periods.

21           6.       Despite actual knowledge of these facts and legal mandates, Defendants have and  
22 continue to enjoy an advantage over their competition and a resultant disadvantage to their workers  
23 by electing not to pay all wages due (including missed meal and rest period compensation) and/or  
24 all penalties due (including “waiting time” penalties) to Class Members.

25           7.       Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, based thereon, alleges that  
26 Defendants’ officers knew of these facts and legal mandates yet, nonetheless, repeatedly  
27 authorized and/or ratified the violation of the laws cited herein.

28



**DEFENDANTS**

1  
2 14. Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, based thereon, alleges that,  
3 at all times herein relevant, Defendants (including the Doe defendants) did business within the  
4 State of California operating a chain of restaurants.

5 15. Those defendants identified as Does 1 through 100, inclusive, are and were, at all  
6 relevant times herein-mentioned, officers, directors, partners, and/or managing agents of some or  
7 each of the remaining defendants. Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, on that  
8 basis, alleges that, at all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, employed  
9 and/or exercised control over the wages, hours, and/or working conditions of the Representative  
10 Plaintiff and Class Members within the State of California.

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

18 17. Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, on that basis, alleges that, at  
19 all relevant times herein mentioned, each of the defendants was the agent and/or employee of each  
20 of the remaining defendants and, in doing the acts herein alleged, was acting within the course and  
21 scope of such agency and/or employment.

22  
23 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

24 18. The Representative Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all  
25 persons similarly situated and proximately damaged by Defendants' conduct including, but not  
26 necessarily limited to, the following Plaintiff Class:

27 "All persons employed by Defendants as non-exempt restaurant  
28 employees in California on or after July 10, 2016."

- 1 19. Defendants' officers and directors are excluded from the Plaintiff Class.
- 2 20. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action
- 3 under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because there is a well-defined community of
- 4 interest in the litigation and the proposed class is easily ascertainable.
- 5 a. Numerosity: A class action is the only available method for the fair
- 6 and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Insofar as
- 7 Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, on that basis,
- 8 alleges that there are sufficient Class Members to meet the
- 9 numerosity requirement, the members of the Plaintiff Class are so
- 10 numerous that joinder of all members is impractical, if not
- 11 impossible. Membership in the class will be determined upon
- 12 analysis of employee and payroll, among other, records maintained
- 13 by Defendants.
- 14 b. Commonality: The Representative Plaintiff(s) and the Class
- 15 Members share a community of interests in that there are numerous
- 16 common questions and issues of fact and law which predominate
- 17 over any questions and issues solely affecting individual members,
- 18 including, but not necessarily limited to:
- 19 1) Whether Defendants violated California Business and
- 20 Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* by failing to provide meal
- 21 and/or rest breaks to Class Members working eligible shifts;
- 22 2) Whether Defendants violated California Labor Code § 1174 by
- 23 failing to keep accurate records of employees' hours of work;
- 24 3) Whether Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 201-
- 25 204 by failing to pay wages due and owing at the time that
- 26 certain Class Members' employment with Defendants
- 27 terminated;
- 28 4) Whether Defendants violated California Labor Code § 226 by
- failing to provide semimonthly itemized statements to Class
- Members of total hours worked by each, all wages earned and
- all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period; and
- 5) Whether Class Members are entitled to "waiting time"
- penalties, pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.
- c. Typicality: The Representative Plaintiff's claims are typical of the
- claims of Class Members. The Representative Plaintiff and Class
- Members sustained damages arising out of and caused by
- Defendants' common course of conduct in violation of law, as
- alleged herein.
- d. Adequacy of Representation: The Representative Plaintiff in this
- class action is an adequate representative of the Plaintiff Class in
- that the Representative Plaintiff's claims are typical of those of the

1 Plaintiff Class and has the same interest in the litigation of this case  
2 as the Class Members. The Representative Plaintiff is committed to  
3 vigorous prosecution of this case and retained competent counsel  
4 who are experienced in conducting litigation of this nature. The  
5 Representative Plaintiff is not subject to any individual defenses  
6 unique from those conceivably applicable to Class Members as a  
7 whole and anticipates no management difficulties in this litigation.

8 e. Superiority of Class Action: Since the damages suffered by  
9 individual Class Members, while not inconsequential, may be  
10 relatively small, the expense and burden of individual litigation by  
11 each member makes or may make it impractical for Class Members  
12 to seek redress individually for the wrongful conduct alleged herein.  
13 Should separate actions be brought, or be required to be brought, by  
14 each individual Class Member, the resulting multiplicity of lawsuits  
15 would cause undue hardship and expense for the Court and the  
16 litigants. The prosecution of separate actions would also create a risk  
17 of inconsistent rulings which might be dispositive of the interests of  
18 other Class Members who are not parties to the adjudications and/or  
19 may substantially impede their ability to adequately protect their  
20 interests.

21 **COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

22 21. As described herein, for years, Defendants have knowingly failed to adequately  
23 compensate those employees within the class definition identified above for all wages earned  
24 (including premium wages such as compensation for missed meal and/or rest periods) under the  
25 California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Order, thereby enjoying a significant  
26 competitive edge over similar companies.

27 22. Defendants have declined to pay these wages, even upon a Class Member's  
28 termination or resignation from employment, in blatant violation of California Labor Code § 201  
and/or § 202.

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

35 24. Furthermore, despite knowledge of the Class Members' entitlement to  
36 compensation for all hours worked, Defendants violated California Labor Code § 1174(d) by

1 failing to provide or require the use, maintenance, or submission of time records by members of  
2 the Plaintiff Class. Defendants also failed to provide Class Members with accurate semimonthly  
3 itemized statements of the total number of hours worked by each, and all applicable hourly rates  
4 in effect, during the pay period, in violation of California Labor Code § 226. In failing to provide  
5 the required documents, Defendants have not only failed to pay their workers the full amount of  
6 compensation due, but have also, until now, effectively shielded themselves from employee  
7 scrutiny by concealing the magnitude and financial impact of their wrongdoing that such  
8 documents might otherwise have led workers to discover.

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

13 26. As a consequence of Defendants' willful conduct in not paying former employees'  
14 compensation for all hours worked in a prompt and timely manner, certain Class Members are  
15 entitled to up to 30 days wages as a penalty under California Labor Code § 203, together with  
16 attorneys' fees and costs.

17 27. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set forth  
18 herein, Class Members have sustained damages, as described above, including compensation for  
19 loss of earnings for hours worked on behalf of Defendants, in an amount to be established at trial.  
20 As a further direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set forth herein,  
21 certain Class Members are entitled to recover "waiting time" penalties (pursuant to California  
22 Labor Code § 203) and penalties for failure to provide semimonthly statements of hours worked  
23 and all applicable hourly rates (pursuant to California Labor Code § 226) in an amount to be  
24 established at trial. As a further direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as  
25 set forth herein, Class Members are also entitled to recover costs and attorneys' fees pursuant to  
26 California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, among other authorities.

27 28. Representative Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants from  
28 engaging in the complained-of illegal labor acts and practices in the future. Representative Plaintiff

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

1 also seeks restitution of costs incurred by Class Members under California's Unfair Competition  
2 Law. Unless enjoined, Defendants' unlawful conduct will continue unchecked, while Class  
3 Members bear the financial brunt of Defendants' unlawful conduct. As a further direct and  
4 proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set forth herein, Class Members are also  
5 entitled to recover costs and attorneys' fees, pursuant to statute.

6  
7 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
8 **UNLAWFUL FAILURE TO PAY WAGES**  
9 **(California Labor Code §§ 200-204, 510, 558, 1194, 1197 and 1198; IWC Wage Order)**

10 29. Each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs is incorporated in this cause  
11 of action with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

12 30. During the limitations period, Class Members performed work for Defendants,  
13 oftentimes in excess of eight hours in a workday and/or forty hours in a workweek. The number  
14 of hours will be proven at trial.

15 31. During the limitations period, Defendants refused to compensate Class Members  
16 for all of the wages they earned, in violation of the applicable IWC Wage Order and provisions of  
17 the California Labor Code.

18 32. At all relevant times, Defendants were aware of, and were under a duty to comply  
19 with, the overtime provisions of the California Labor Code including, but not limited to, California  
20 Labor Code §§ 510, 1194 and 1198.

21 33. California Labor Code § 510(a) provides, in pertinent part:

22 Any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess  
23 of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the  
24 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.

25 34. California Labor Code § 1194(a) provides, in pertinent part:

26 Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee  
27 receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime  
28 compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil  
action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or



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

1 overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit.

2 35. California Labor Code § 1198 provides, in pertinent part:

3 The maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor fixed by  
4 the commission shall be the maximum hours of work and the standard  
5 conditions of labor for employees. The employment of any employee for  
6 longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor  
7 prohibited by the order is unlawful.

8 36. By refusing to compensate Class Members for minimum wages and/or overtime  
9 wages earned, Defendants violated those California Labor Code provisions cited herein as well as  
10 the applicable IWC Wage Order.

11 37. Defendants' conduct, as heretofore detailed, represents underpayment of wages  
12 pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218, *et seq.*, 558, 1194, *et seq.*, and 1197, *et seq.*, for which  
13 damages and/or penalties are now sought in an amount according to proof.

14 38. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set forth  
15 herein, Class Members have sustained damages, including loss of earnings for hours of overtime  
16 worked on behalf of Defendants, in an amount to be established at trial. As a further direct and  
17 proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set forth herein, Class Members are entitled  
18 to recover penalties in amounts to be established at trial, as well as attorneys' fees and costs, and  
19 restitution, pursuant to statute.

20 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
21 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL AND REST PERIODS**  
22 **(California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512)**

23 39. Each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs is incorporated in this cause  
24 of action with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

25 40. At all relevant times, Defendants were aware of and were under a duty to comply  
26 with California Labor Code § 226.7 and §512.

27 41. California Labor Code § 226.7 provides, in pertinent part:  
28

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

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

6 42. Moreover, California Labor Code § 512(a) provides, in pertinent part:

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

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

16 44. Section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order provides:

17 (A) No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than  
18 five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes...

19 (B) An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more  
20 than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a  
second meal period of not less than 30 minutes...

21 (C) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance  
22 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.

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

24 (A) Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest  
25 periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work  
26 period. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours  
worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours  
or major fraction thereof ....

27 (B) If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in  
28 accordance with the applicable provisions of this order, the employer shall

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

1 pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of  
2 compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

3 46. By failing to consistently provide uninterrupted thirty-minute meal periods within  
4 the first five hours of work each day, a second uninterrupted thirty-minute meal period within the  
5 first ten hours of work each day and/or uninterrupted net ten-minute rest periods to Class Members,  
6 Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order provisions.

7 47. Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, on that basis, alleges that  
8 Defendants have never paid the one hour of compensation to any Class Member due to their  
9 violations of the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order provisions.

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

13 49. As a further direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set  
14 forth herein, certain Class Members are entitled to recover "waiting time" penalties in amounts to  
15 be established at trial, as well as recovery of attorneys' fees and costs, pursuant to statute.

16  
17 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**  
18 **(California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1174)**

19 50. Each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs is incorporated in this cause  
20 of action with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

21 51. California Labor Code § 226(a) provides:

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

28 52. Moreover, California Labor Code § 226(e) provides:

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

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

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

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

54. Defendants have failed to provide timely, accurate itemized wage statements to the Class Members in accordance with California Labor Code § 226. Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, on that basis, alleges that none of the statements provided by Defendants accurately reflected actual gross wages earned, net wages earned, or the appropriate deductions for Class Members.

55. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set forth herein, the Class Members are entitled to penalties in an amount to be established at trial and are entitled to recover attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**FAILURE TO PAY WAGES ON TERMINATION**  
**(California Labor Code § 203)**

56. Each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs is incorporated in this cause of action with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

57. California Labor Code § 203 provides that:

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



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

RELIEF SOUGHT

1  
2           **WHEREFORE, the Representative Plaintiff**, individually and on behalf of the proposed  
3 Plaintiff Class, prays for judgment and the following specific relief against Defendants, and each  
4 of them, jointly and separately, as follows:

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

8           2.       That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants willfully violated their  
9 legal duties to pay all wages due under the California Labor Code and the applicable California  
10 Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order;

11           3.       That the Court make an award to Class Members of one hour of pay at each  
12 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not provided;

13           4.       That the Court make an award to Class Members of one hour of pay at each  
14 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not provided;

15           5.       That the Court order Defendants to pay restitution to Class Members due to  
16 Defendants' unlawful activities, pursuant to California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200-  
17 17208;

18           6.       That the Court further enjoin Defendants, ordering them to cease and desist from  
19 unlawful activities in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*;

20           7.       For interest on the amount of any and all economic losses, at the prevailing legal  
21 rate;

22           8.       That the Court make an award to Class Members of penalties, pursuant to California  
23 Labor Code §§ 203, 226, 558, 1174.5 and/or liquidated damages pursuant to § 1194.2, in an amount  
24 to be proven at trial;

25           9.       For reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §  
26 1021.5 and Labor Code § 218.5;

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

28

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


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

**JURY DEMAND**

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

Dated: July 10, 2020

**SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC**

By:   
Laura Van Note, Esq.  
Attorneys for Representative Plaintiff  
and the Plaintiff Class

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