	\frown			
1 2 3 4 5 6	Jenna L Miara (SBN 305703) jmiara@bettzedek.org Sebastian Sanchez (SBN 313099) ssanchez@bettzedek.org Kelsey R Chapple (SBN 313928) kchapple@bettzedek.org BET TZEDEK LEGAL SERVICES 3250 Wilshire Blvd. 13 th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90010 Telephone: (323) 939-0506 Facsimile: (213) 471-4568 Matthew K Handley (to apply for admission pro have	vice)		
7 8 9	Matthew K Handley (to apply for admission <i>pro hac vice</i>) mhandey@hfajustice.com HANDLEY FARAH & ANDERSON PLLC 777 6 th Street, NW Eleventh Floor Washington, DC 20001			
10	Attorneys for Plaintiffs			
11 12		E STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
13	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES (UNLIMITED JURISDICTION)			
14				
15	WALTERIO LOPEZ and RIJEL LINDA EGGAN TAVELLA, individually and on behalf of all	Case No.:		
16	aggrieved employees and the general public,	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT		
17	Plaintiffs,	FOR DAMAGES, RESTITUTION, AND CIVIL PENALTIES FOR:		
18	v.	 Conversion Failure to Provide Meal Periods and 		
19	CANON GARDEN, INC., a California Corporation	Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Breaks (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512)		
20	dba CAFFE ROMA; SANDRO SCIANDRI, an individual; AGOSTINO SCIANDRI, an individual;	3. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements (Lab. Code § 226)		
21 22	MICHELE RIVIELLO, an individual; and DAVIDE GILIBERTI, an individual; and DOES 1	 Failure to Pay All Wages Due Upon Discharge or Quit (Lab. Code §§ 201-203) Unfair Competition (Bus. & Profs. Code §§ 		
23	through 50, inclusive,	 6. Civil Penalties Pursuant to Private 		
23	Defendants.	Attorney General Act (Lab. Code §§ 2698 et seq.)		
25		DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL		
26		UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE		
27	//			
28	··· //			
Ì				
	1			
	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT			

CLASS	ACTION	COMPL	AINT
-------	--------	-------	------

Plaintiffs WALTERIO LOPEZ and RIJEL LINDA EGGAN TAVELLA on their own behalf, on behalf of all similarly situated aggrieved employees of Defendants, and on behalf of the general public, allege as follows:

INTRODUCTION

 Plaintiffs are former employees of Caffe Roma, a well-known Beverly Hills restaurant. This California class action arises from Defendants' scheme to pool tips to pay managerial staff and to deny legally mandated meal and rest periods. Under Caffe Roma's mandatory "tip pooling policy" Defendants required tipped employees to contribute up to 40% of their collected tips, a portion of which was then paid to managerial staff. Defendants thereby obtain an illegal "tip credit" against wages they owe and cause tipped employees to lose a portion of their tips.

2. Plaintiffs bring this action to recover their stolen tips, premium wages, interest, liquidated damages, and penalties based on the Defendants' violations of their rights under California labor law, including the California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order 5-2001 ("Wage Order 5").

3. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' actions not only violate numerous provisions of the California Labor Code, but also constitute unfair business practices under California's Unfair Competition Law, Bus. & Profs. Code §§ 17200, *et seq*. (hereinafter "UCL"). Plaintiffs assert that Defendants' violations of state labor laws are unlawful acts which have afforded Defendants an unfair competitive advantage over restaurants that comply with California wage and hour laws. Thus, Plaintiffs seek restitution, disgorgement, and other equitable relief to remedy Defendants' illegal and unfair business practices.

4. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' actions are business-wide practices with respect to current and former employees of Caffe Roma. As such, Plaintiff LOPEZ also brings an action under the California Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA) on behalf of all aggrieved employees and the general public for penalties arising from Defendants' numerous violations of the California Labor Code.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff WALTERIO LOPEZ is an individual who currently resides in Los Angeles County and at all times relevant to this action resided in Los Angeles County. Plaintiff LOPEZ was employed

1

2

3

by Defendants in Los Angeles County from approximately August 17, 2017 through July 1, 2018 as a 1 busser. Plaintiff LOPEZ worked for Defendants at Caffe Roma, located at 350 N Canon Dr, Beverly 2 Hills, CA 90210, in Los Angeles County. During his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff LOPEZ 3 was paid by the hour and received tips from customers. Plaintiff LOPEZ's most recent pay rate was 4 \$11.00 per hour. As a busser, Plaintiff LOPEZ was subject to CAFFE ROMA's company-wide policy 5 of denying mandatory meal and rest periods. As a busser, Plaintiff LOPEZ was also subject to CAFFE 6 7 ROMA's mandatory, company-wide, "tip-pooling policy" in that he was a recipient of a portion of the 8 pooled tips.

9 6. Plaintiff RIJEL LINDA EGGAN TAVELLA is an individual who currently resides in Los Angeles County and at all times relevant to this action resided in Los Angeles County. Plaintiff 10 TAVELLA was employed by Defendants in Los Angeles County from, on or around May 10, 2017 11 through, on or around October 18, 2017 as a server. Plaintiff TAVELLA worked for Defendants at Caffe 12 Roma, located at 350 N Canon Dr, Beverly Hills, CA 90210, in Los Angeles County. During her 13 employment with Defendants, Plaintiff TAVELLA was paid by the hour and received tips from 14 customers. Plaintiff TAVELLA's most recent pay rate was \$10.50 per hour. As a server, Plaintiff 15 TAVELLA was subject to CAFFE ROMA's mandatory, company-wide, "tip-pooling policy" as both a 16 contributor to the tip pool and a recipient of a portion of the pooled tips. As a server, Plaintiff TAVELLA 17 18 was also subject to CAFFE ROMA's company-wide policy of denying mandatory meal and rest periods.

19 7. Defendant CANON GARDEN, INC., doing business as CAFFE ROMA (hereinafter "CAFFE ROMA"), is a Corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of California, and at all 20 times relevant to this action was doing business in Los Angeles County. The registered California address for CAFFE ROMA is 350 N Canon Dr, Beverly Hills, CA 90210, and its agent for service of process is MICHELE RIVIELLO with an agent address at 350 N Canon Dr., Beverly Hills, 90210.

21

22

23

26

27

28

8. Defendant CANON GARDEN, INC. was doing business as CAFFE ROMA at all times 24 25 relevant to this action in Los Angeles County.

9. Even though Defendant CANON GARDEN, INC. regularly transacts business in the State of California for profit under the fictitious business name of Caffe Roma, and on information and belief has 11

done so for at least five (5) years, it has failed and refused to file a fictitious business name statement for 1 2 Caffe Roma, all in violation of Business & Professions Code §§ 17902 and 17910.

3

4

5

6

7

8

21

10. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendants SANDRO SCIANDRI, AGOSTINO SCIANDRI, MICHELE RIVIELLO, and DAVIDE GILIBERTI, were owners, managers or major interest holders of Defendant CAFFE ROMA during the period of the complaint. Plaintiffs further allege that these Defendants, acting on behalf of CAFFE ROMA, are responsible for the occurrences and violations herein alleged and that the resulting damages were proximately caused by these Defendants' conduct.

9 11. The true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or corporate, of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 50, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiffs, who therefore 10 sues Defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiffs will seek 11 leave from this Court to amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. 12 Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious Defendants, whether 13 individual, partners, agents, or corporate, was responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions 14 15 alleged herein, and proximately caused Plaintiffs and the Classes to be subject to the unlawful 16 employment practices, wrongs, injuries and damages complained of herein.

12. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that at all times mentioned in 17 this Complaint, each and every Defendant was the agent or employee of each and every other 18 19 Defendant, and in doing the acts alleged, was acting within the course and scope of such agency or 20employment, with the consent, provision, and authorization of each of the remaining Defendants. All actions of each Defendant were ratified and approved by every other Defendant.

22 13. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that at all times mentioned in this Complaint, each and every Defendant entered into a conspiracy and agreement with every other 23 Defendant, or later joined that conspiracy and ratified the acts and conduct of other defendants who had 24 entered the conspiracy. Plaintiffs are further informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that at all 25 times mentioned in this Complaint, all Defendants knowingly and willfully entered into that conspiracy. 26 All Defendants' acts and failures to act as alleged in this Complaint were perpetrated in furtherance of 27 28 the conspiracy.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

14. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §§ 395(a) and 395.5. Defendants and Plaintiffs are all residents of the State of California. Defendants maintain their business in Los Angeles County. Defendants also employed Plaintiffs in Los Angeles County and the alleged unlawful acts occurred in Los Angeles County. As a result, Defendants' obligations to Plaintiffs and the violations of law alleged herein arose in Los Angeles County within the jurisdiction of this Court.

15. This case falls within the Court's unlimited jurisdiction because the amount in controversy exceeds \$25,000.

CLASS DEFINITION

16. The Class consists of current and former CAFFE ROMA employees, who at any time during the period commencing on the date that is within four years prior to the filing of this Complaint and through the time this action proceeds to final judgment or settlement (the "Class Period") held the position of "Server," "Busser" or "Bartender" including any of Defendants' job positions with substantially similar titles and duties (the "Class").

17. Plaintiffs bring this class action for compensatory damages, punitive damages, injunctive relief, disgorgement, restitution, and to recover, among other things, penalties for failure to provide required meal and rest breaks, to maintain accurate records and to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and interest, attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses.

18. Plaintiffs reserve the right to redefine the above Class, name additional class representatives, and/or to establish subclasses and subclass representatives as appropriate based on discovery and specific theories of liability.

19. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the Class against Defendants, the Class Period should be adjusted accordingly.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

20. Plaintiffs and the Class were employed by Defendants pursuant to oral contracts of employment to perform the work of servers, bussers and bartenders at Caffe Roma. Plaintiffs and the Class were all paid by the hour.

1 21. Plaintiff TAVELLA and the other members of the Class who were servers and bartenders, regularly received tips from customers as part of their work. Defendants did and continue to maintain a 2 mandatory policy requiring servers and bartenders to contribute up to forty (40) percent of collected tips 3 to a tip-pool. Defendants distributed, and continue to distribute, a portion of the employee tip pool to 4 managerial personnel. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and other class members with a proper 5 accounting showing all other individuals who received shares of their earned tips. 6

22. Plaintiffs and the Class were entitled to, but denied, the portion of the tips taken and distributed to managerial personnel, and continue to be so entitled and denied.

9 23. During the Class Period, Plaintiffs and members of the Class regularly worked, and continue to regularly work, more than five hours during their shifts without being provided the legally mandated 30-minute meal period relieving them of all duty. During the Class Period, Plaintiffs and other members of the Class worked, and continue to work, more than ten hours during their shifts without being provided the legally required second 30-minute meal period relieving them of all duty. When Defendants failed to provide the required meal periods, they also failed to pay such employees one hour of pay as premium wages, and such failures continue.

24. During the Class Period, Plaintiffs and the Class regularly worked, and continue to regularly 16 work, more than four hours during their shifts without being provided the legally mandated 10-minute rest period. When Defendants failed to provide the required rest periods, they also failed to pay such 18 19 employees one hour of pay as premium wages, and such failures continue.

25. Plaintiff TAVELLA ended her employment with CAFFE ROMA on or around October 18, 2017. Plaintiff LOPEZ ended his employment with CAFFE ROMA on July 3, 2018. Upon the termination of Plaintiffs' employment, Defendants failed to pay the premium wages owed to them. On information and belief, Defendants also failed to make such payments for all other members of the Class who are former employees of Defendants.

26. On information and belief, Plaintiffs and Class members were unsophisticated in matters of employment law, of modest means, and lacked education, rendering them vulnerable due to their lack of means and sophistication.

28

11

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1 27. On information and belief, Defendants SANDRO SCIANDRI, AGOSTINO SCIANDRI, 2 RIVIELLO, and GILIBERTI personally participated in the labor violations alleged herein. Defendants SANDRO SCIANDRI and AGOSTINO SCIANDRI directed their managers and supervisors including 3 Defendants RIVIELLO and GILIBERTI to distribute portions of the tip pool to managerial personnel. 4 They failed to create or implement policies or procedures for hourly employees to receive lawful meal or 5 rest periods, or premium pay in lieu thereof. Labor Code § 558.1 provides that an "owner, director, 6 7 officer or managing agent of the employer" may be "held liable as the employer" for violating or causing to be violated "any provision regulating minimum wages or hours and days of work in any order of the 8 Industrial Welfare Commission," or Labor Code §§ 203, 226, 226.7, 1193.6, 1194, or 2802. Defendants 9 SANDRO SCIANDRI, AGOSTINO SCIANDRI, RIVIELLO, and GILIBERTI may be held liable for 10 11 the labor violations alleged herein pursuant to Labor Code § 558.1.

28. During the Class Period, Defendants failed, and continue to fail, to provide properly itemized
wage statements to Plaintiffs and, on information and belief, the Class. The wage statements provided
by Defendants to Plaintiffs, and on information and belief, the Class, failed to provide include the name
of the legal entity that is the employer, and such failure continues.

29. During the Class Period, each Defendant directly or indirectly or through an agent or other person, engaged, suffered or permitted Plaintiffs and the Class to work.

30. During the Class Period, each Defendant directly or indirectly or through an agent or other person exercised control over the wages, hours or working conditions of Plaintiffs and the Class.

20

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

31. This class action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a class action as set forth in Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

NUMEROSITY

32. There is an ascertainable and sufficiently numerous class. On information and belief, there are over 40 class members who can be readily identified by CAFFE ROMA's own records, the Class is ascertainable and so numerous that the joinder of all such persons is impracticable and the disposition of their claims will benefit the parties and the Court.

28

COMMONALITY

33. There is a well-defined community of interest. Each class member has been damaged by the same conduct, in the same way: they have paid out monies pursuant to CAFFE ROMA's unlawful and unreasonable "tip-pooling" scheme, and they have been denied meal and rest breaks mandated by California law.

34. Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues raised herein are common to the Class, will apply uniformly to the Class, and, as a practical matter, will be dispositive of interests of the other members not party to the adjudication.

9 35. There are common questions of law and fact that predominate across the Class, including: (1) whether CAFFE ROMA's tip pooling policy is lawful; (2) the operation and effect of CAFFE 10 ROMA's tip pooling policy; (3) whether Defendants converted Class members' tips; (4) whether Defendants denied members of the Class meal and rest breaks; (5) whether Defendants failed to provide 12 13 accurate wage statements; (6) whether Defendants' conduct as described herein is unlawful, 14 unreasonable, unfair, and/or deceptive; (7) whether Class members have sustained damages; (8) the proper measure of their damages; and (9) whether Defendants' conduct warrants punitive damages. 15

PREDOMINANCE

36. Issues subject to generalized proof and applicable to the Class as a whole predominate over those issues that are subject to only individualized proof, if any.

37. The common questions of law and fact described above are the most significant questions for the Class, the resolution of which will resolve the claims other than calculating damages for each class member.

TYPICALITY AND ADEQUACY

38. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the Class. Plaintiffs understand the claims and are able to represent the interests of the Class, and their interests are aligned with that of the Class. The interests of Plaintiffs are not antagonistic to the Class.

39. Plaintiffs have chosen attorneys who are experienced in wage and hour claims, class action claims, and complex litigation.

28

11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

40. Counsel and the Class representative will adequately and diligently pursue the interests of 1 2 the Class.

SUPERIORITY

41. A class action is the superior method of resolving this dispute. Plaintiffs allege a common course of wrongful conduct by CAFFE ROMA, making the case particularly well suited to certification. 42. Given the modest value of individual damages, it is not economically feasible to obtain relief within the traditional framework of a multiplicity of small individual suits for damages. Aggrieved persons will be without any effective redress unless they may employ the class-action device.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(By All Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and the Class Against All Defendants for Conversion)

43. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth at this place.

44. California Labor Code § 351 prohibits employers or agents of employers from taking any 13 14 tip paid, given to, or left for an employee.

45. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiffs and the Class had an ownership interest in and the lawful right to immediately possess their tips, which constituted their property.

46. During the Class Period, by operation of Defendants' unlawful tip-pooling scheme in violation of Labor Code § 351 and common law, Defendants substantially interfered with the rights of Plaintiffs and the Class to receive and possess their tips. Instead, Defendants wrongfully assumed actual control or ownership of the tips, and kept them for themselves, thereby harming Plaintiff and the Class.

47. In taking the tips of the Class, Defendants had the intention and purpose to exercise ownership over them and to prevent Plaintiff and the Class from taking possession of their own tips.

48. Defendants were aware that Plaintiffs and the Class were unsophisticated with the law, and not likely to appreciate, understand, and/or comprehend that Defendants were wrongfully converting their tips.

49. Plaintiffs and the Class could not have reasonably prevented the conversion. At all times 26 mentioned herein, Defendants were aware that Plaintiffs and the Class were in a relatively disadvantaged 27 situation economically as compared to Defendants. Defendants preyed on Plaintiffs and the Class 28

because Plaintiffs and the Class were unsophisticated and economically disadvantaged. Taking advantage of the lack of sophistication of Plaintiffs and the Class, Defendants concealed facts regarding the rights of the Plaintiffs and the Class to receive and possess all of their tips, preventing them from discovering the conversion thereof. It was only in early 2018 that Plaintiffs discovered potential wrongdoing, which was later confirmed.

50. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants knew they could take advantage of the rights of Plaintiffs and the Class because they knew they could prey on their relatively disadvantaged and unsophisticated CAFFE ROMA employees.

51. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the Defendants' conduct, as set forth above, pursuant to Civil Code § 3336, Plaintiffs and the Class have been damaged and are entitled to and seek to recover an amount equal to the value of tips at the time of the conversion, with interest. On information and belief, the amount of tips recoverable by each Plaintiff and the Class is information that is presumptively within the knowledge and exclusive control of the Defendants, and will be ascertainable through discovery procedures.

52. Plaintiffs and the Class are also entitled to compensation for the time and money expended in recovering the unlawfully converted tips.

53. The conduct of Defendants, as set forth above, was malicious, oppressive and fraudulent, and constitutes an intentional scheme to defraud Plaintiffs and the Class, with the intention of causing injury to them by depriving them of the payment of tips they were entitled to, which were necessary for Plaintiff and the Class to pay for necessaries of life for themselves and their families, and was carried out by Defendants with a willful and conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff and the Class. The actions of Defendants constitute despicable conduct that subjected Plaintiff and the Class to cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of their rights. The above conduct justifies an award of punitive damages against Defendants in an amount to be proven at trial.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(By All Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and the Class Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods, Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512; Wage Order 5 §§ 11, 12)

54. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth at this place.

55. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order 5-2001 ("Wage Order 5") §§ 11 and 12 require employers to permit their employees to take specified paid rest breaks and unpaid meal periods, and provide statutory damages in the form of wages to be paid by employers who violate these provisions.

56. Labor Code § 512 states 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." Wage Order 5 § 11 also provides that employees are entitled to a meal period of at least 30 minutes for every five hours worked.

57. Wage Order 5 § 12 provides that employees are entitled to a rest period of at least ten minutes for every four hours worked or major fraction thereof.

58. Wage Order 5 §§ 11(B) and 12(B) and Labor Code § 226.7 require an employer to pay one hour's wage to an employee for each meal period and for each rest period the employer fails to provide in accordance with the law.

59. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and other members of the Class with meal periods in accordance with California law, causing Plaintiffs and the Class to work more than five hour work periods without at least one thirty minute meal period, and causing Plaintiffs and other members of the Class to work more than ten hour work periods without providing a second thirty minute meal period.

60. Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs and the Class to take rest periods in accordance with California law, causing Plaintiffs and the Class to work more than four hour work periods without at least ten minute rest periods.

61. At all relevant times, Plaintiffs and the Class desired to take meal periods, but were prevented from taking these breaks due to Defendants' policies and practices.

62. At all relevant times, Plaintiffs and the Class desired to take rest periods, but were prevented from taking these breaks due to Defendants' policies and practices.

63. Defendants failed to keep accurate information with respect to each employee's meal periods in violation of Wage Order 5 § 7(A)(3).

11

1

2

64. As a result of the Defendants' practices, Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to and seek to recover premium compensation in an amount equal to one hour of additional wages at the applicable contractual rate of pay for each work day on which Defendants failed to provide them with meal periods, and Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to one hour of additional wages for each work day on which Defendants failed to provide them with rest periods, in amounts to be proven at trial.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(By All Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and the Class Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements, Labor Code § 226(a) and (e), Wage Order 5 § 7)

65. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth at this place.

66. Under Labor Code § 226, for each pay period, employers must furnish each employee with an accurate itemized statement reflecting the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer. Wage Order 5 §7(B) similarly requires employers semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish to each employee an itemized statement in writing showing the correct name of the employer.

67. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiffs and the Class with accurate itemized wage statements that reflected the name of the legal entity that is the employer in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(8).

68. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e), Plaintiffs and the Class are each entitled to and seek to recover \$50 for the first violation and \$100 for each subsequent violation, not to exceed \$4,000 per employee. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e), Plaintiffs are entitled to and seek recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(By All Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and the Class Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay All Wages Due Upon Discharge or Quit, Labor Code §§ 201-203)

69. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth at this place.

70. Labor Code § 201 requires that an employer pay all wages earned and unpaid to an employee immediately upon discharge of that employee. Labor Code § 202 requires that an employer pays all wages earned and unpaid not later than 72 hours after an employee quits.

71. Labor Code § 203 authorizes an employee to recover penalties in an amount equal to the former employee's daily wages for up to 30 days if an employer willfully fails to pay any wages due to the employee at the time of discharge, or within 72 hours if the employee quits.

72. Plaintiffs and members of the Class who are former employees were denied the premium wages owed to them. Defendants' failure was willful and intentional.

73. As a result of Defendants' willful failure to pay Plaintiffs and the Class all wages due in accordance with Labor Code §§ 201 and 202, Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to and seek to recover waiting time penalties equal to thirty days' pay in amounts to be proven at trial.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(By All Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and the Class Against All Defendants for Violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*)

74. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth at this place.

75. The conduct alleged against Defendants in this complaint includes theft of tips, failing to provide meal and rest breaks, failing to provide accurate itemized wage stubs, and failing to pay wages owed upon discharge, all in violations of the sections of the Labor Code set forth above. These practices are all unfair business practices under California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq*. These unfair business practices, by definition, constitute unfair competition in violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq*.

76. Plaintiffs and the Class have been injured and lost money or property as a result of the practices alleged in this complaint.

77. Defendants, by the acts and/or omissions alleged herein, have injured and are injuring the interests of the general public in that other employers who have been or currently are employing restaurant workers and attempting to do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws

(including the laws violated by the Defendants) are at an unfair competitive disadvantage as a result of the Defendants' conduct.

78. Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to and seek restitution of their wages and the economic value of benefits unlawfully denied them by the Defendants in amounts to be proven at trial.

79. Pursuant to Bus. & P. C. § 17203, Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to and seek an order and judgment permanently restraining and enjoining Defendants, and their agents and employees, from directly or indirectly violating any of the above-mentioned provisions of the Labor Code.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(By Plaintiff LOPEZ on behalf of himself and all similarly situated aggrieved persons Against All Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorney General Act, Lab. Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*)

80. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the above paragraphs of this Complaint.

81. Plaintiff LOPEZ is an aggrieved employee as defined in Labor Code § 2699(a). He brings this claim on behalf of himself and other current or former employees affected by the labor law violations alleged in this complaint.

82. Defendants committed the following violations of the Labor Code against Plaintiff LOPEZ, and, on information and belief, against other current or former employees while they were employed by Defendants:

- a. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 by failing to pay Plaintiff LOPEZ, and on information and belief, other former employees of Defendants, all wages due upon discharge or within 72 hours of receipt of notice of employees' voluntary termination.
- b. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198, and 1199 by failing to provide
 Plaintiff LOPEZ, and on information and belief, other current and former employees of
 Defendants, all meal and rest periods in accordance with Wage Order 5.
- c. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226.3 by failing to provide Plaintiff
 LOPEZ, and on information and belief, other current and former employees of
 Defendants, with accurate written itemized statements for each payment of wages.

d. Defendants violated Labor Code § 351 by failing to provide Plaintiff LOPEZ, and on information and belief, other current and former employees of Defendants, all tips due by distributing tips to managerial personnel.

83. On April 25, 2019, Plaintiff LOPEZ sent notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) of the specific violations and the facts and theories supporting those violations. On June 13, 2019 Defendants received this notice. Over 65 days have passed since the date the notice was received by Defendants and LWDA.

84. Pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*), Plaintiff LOPEZ, acting in the public interest as private attorneys general, seeks assessment and collection of civil penalties for the violations listed above, including amounts sufficient to recover unpaid regular and overtime wages due to Plaintiff LOPEZ and other current and former employees. Under Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), Plaintiff LOPEZ is also entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

85. Defendants SANDRO SCIANDRI, AGOSTINO SCIANDRI, RIVIELLO, and GILIBERTI were "persons" acting on behalf of an employer who violated, or caused to be violated, multiple provisions of the Labor Code with respect to Plaintiff and Class Members. Accordingly, these Defendants may be held individually liable for civil penalties under PAGA.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and the Class and on behalf of the general public, pray for judgment and the following specific relief against Defendants as follows:

1. An order certifying the proposed Class and appointing Plaintiffs and their counsel of record to represent the proposed Class;

2. For compensatory and statutory damages in an amount according to proof;

3. For punitive damages in an amount according to proof;

4. For penalties in an amount according to proof;

5. For restitution and disgorgement of monies in an amount according to proof;

Pursuant to Bus. & P. C. § 17203, an order permanently enjoining and restraining
 Defendants from continuing the unfair, deceptive, and unlawful business practices

28 //

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

		\frown		
1		alleged herein, including, but not limited to an order permanently restraining and		
2		enjoining Defendants, and their agents and employees from directly or indirectly:		
3		A. Violating any provision of Labor Code § 351, including distributing tips to		
4		managerial personnel;		
5		B. Violating any provision of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, including failing to		
6		provide the required meal or rest periods;		
7		C. Violating any provision of Labor Code §§ 226(a) and (e), including failing to		
8		furnish each employee with an accurate itemized statement reflecting the legal		
9	name and address of the legal entity that is the employer;			
10		D. Violating any provision of Labor Code §§ 201-203, including failing to pay		
11		each employee all wages due upon discharge or within 72 hours of receipt of		
12		notice of employees' voluntary termination.		
13	7.	For attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs of suit under California Labor Code §§ 226(e),		
14	2699(g)(1), California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and under any other			
15		applicable statute, and an amount according to proof;		
16	8.	For pre-judgment and post-judgement interest; and		
17	9.	9. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.		
18				
19	Date: August 20, 2	2019 BET TZEDEK LEGAL SERVICES, INC.		
20		In		
21		Jenna Miara Attorney for Plaintiffs and Putative Class		
22		,		
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	16CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT			

		\frown	
1	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		
2	Plaintiffs and all class members hereby	demand a jury trial on all claims and causes of action	
3	with respect to which they have such a right.		
4			
5	Date: August 20, 2019	BET TZEDEK LEGAL SERVICES, INC.	
6		1 mi	
7		Jenna Miara	
8		Attomey for Plaintiffs and Putative Class	
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17 18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		_17	
	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT		