CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Rafael Marquez Amaro, J and others similarly situat		on behalf of themse	elves		NG, INC., a California C ES, INC., a California C	Corporation; GERAWAN orporation; Does 1-10,
(b) County of Residence of	First Listed Plaintiff Fr	esno		i .	of First Listed Defendant	Fresno
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)					(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES C	r
				NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT	NDEMNATION CASES, USE T OF LAND INVOLVED.	HE LOCATION OF
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Marcos Camacho, ALC, M Bakersfield, CA 93304 - (Marcos Camacho -122 661) 324-8100 - Kings	7 California Ave., ley & Kingsley, AF	C	Attorneys (If Known)		
Eric Kingsley, 16133 Ven	tura Bl., Ste. 1200, En	çino, CA 91436				
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)			RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)
(1) U.S. Government Plaintiff	☑ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government N	let α Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State		PTF DEF
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi)	p of Parties in Hem III)	Citiz	en of Another State	2 2 Incorporated and of Business In	
				en or Subject of a CJ preign Country	3 🗘 3 Foreign Nation	0 6 0 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			T EV	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
CONTRACT 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	RTS PERSONAL INJUR		25 Drug Related Scizure	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	O 375 False Claims Act
☐ 120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane	🗗 365 Personal Injury -	.	of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 400 State Reapportionment
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability	Product Liability 367 Health Care/	. 🗗 61	90 Other	28 USC 157	410 Antitrust430 Banks and Banking
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	🗘 320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical			PROPERTY RIGHTS	450 Commerce
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Slander ☐ 330 Federal Employers'	Personal Injury Product Liability			☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent	☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	☐ 368 Asbestos Persona	.		☐ 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine	Injury Product	<u> </u>	LIDOD	DOOTAL DECEMBERS	480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV
(Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 345 Marine Product Liability	Liability PERSONAL PROPE	RTY 07	LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff)	850 Securities/Commodities/
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	☐ 370 Other Fraud		Act	☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	Exchange
160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	371 Truth in Lending	7 10 7	20 Labor/Management	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Trite XVI	 □ 890 Other Standory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 360 Other Personal	380 Other Personal Property Damage		Relations 40 Railway Labor Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	893 Environmental Matters
196 Franchise	Injury	☐ 385 Property Damage		51 Family and Medical		☐ 895 Freedom of Information
	☐ 362 Personal Injury -	Product Liability	Na 7	Leave Act 90 Other Labor Litigation		Act 896 Arbitration
REAL PROPERTY	Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO		91 Employee Retirement	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus:		Income Security Act	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	Act/Review or Appeal of
220 Foreclosure	441 Voling	 463 Alien Detained 510 Motions to Vacat 	.		or Defendant) 371 IRS—Third Party	Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land	☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/	Sentence			26 USC 7609	State Statutes
245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations	☐ 530 General		***************************************		1
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 	535 Death Penalty Other:	(7.4	IMMIGRATION 62 Naturalization Application	1	1
		☐ 540 Mandamus & Ot		65 Other Immigration		1
	Other	O 550 Civil Rights		Actions		1
	448 Education	 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - 	·			
		Conditions of				
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Confinement Remanded from Appellate Court		nstated or 🗗 5 Transfe	erred from	
		•••		(specify)	,	
	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta 28 H.S.C. Section	itute under which you a n 1331, 29 U.S.C.	are tiling (Section	(Do not cite jurisdictional state) 1854 and 28 U.S.C.	utes untess diversity); Section 1367.	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of ca					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	OHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTIO 3, F.R.Cv.P.	N I	DEMAND S	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	y if demanded in complaint: D: ※ Yes □ No
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S)	·				
IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER _	
DATE		SIGNAPORE OF A	TTORNEY	OF RECORD		
02/03/2014		aci		_	•	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
RECEIPT# A	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. J	JDGE

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MARCOS CAMACHO, A LAW COR MARCOS R. CAMACHO ESQ., SBN-mcamacho@mclawmail.com MARIO G. MARTIEZ, ESQ. SBN-200 mariomtz@mclawmail.com 1227 California Ave. BAKERSFIELD, CA 93304 (661) 324 - 8100; FAX (661) 324 - 8103 KINGSLEY & KINGSLEY, APC ERIC B. KINGSLEY, ESQ. SBN-1851 eric@kingsleykingsley.com LIANE KATZENSTEIN LY, ESQ. SB liane@kingsleykingsley.com 16133 Ventura Blvd., Suite 1200 Encino, CA 91436 (818) 990-8300, Fax (818) 990-2903 Attorneys for Plaintiffs	-123501 0721 23
11		
12	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
13	FOR THE EASTERN DI	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14		
15 16 17 18	Rafael Marquez Amaro, Jesus Alarcon Urzua, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, v. GERAWAN FARMING, INC., a California Corporation; GERAWAN	CASE NO. CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR: 1. Violation of Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act
20 21	FARMING PARTNERS, INC., a California Corporation; DOES 1 - 10, inclusive,	 Failure to Pay Minimum Wages Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime Failure to Compensate Rest Breaks Penalties Pursuant to Lab. Code
22	Defendants.	§ 203 6. Violation of Business & Professions
23 24		Code § 17200
2 4 25		
26		•
27		
28		
		1

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs Rafael Marquez Amaro and Jesus Alarcon Urzua for themselves and all other persons similarly situated ("Plaintiffs"), complain of Defendants GERAWAN FARMING, INC., and GERAWAN FARMING PARTNERS, INC.(hereinafter "GERAWAN" or "Defendants") as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- This is a class action by current and former employees of GERAWAN 1. for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties, unpaid overtime and wages, failure to provide paid rest breaks, restitution, attorneys' fees and costs, and injunctive relief.
- Defendants are engaged jointly in the business of growing table grapes 2. and other agricultural commodities, on land located primarily in Fresno, Madera and Tulare Counties, California.
- The Named Plaintiffs are seasonal farm workers who have worked in 3. Defendants' table grape fields and/or tree fruit orchards. On behalf of themselves and the class, Plaintiffs complain that GERAWAN has required its agricultural workers to perform unpaid and/or undercompensated work in violation of federal and state wage and hour laws.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

The Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' federal claims pursuant to 28 4. U.S.C. §1331 and 29 U.S.C. §1854. The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

5. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1891(d) because the actions at issue took place in this district.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

6. This case is properly assigned to the Fresno Division of this Court because the action arose in Fresno, California and Defendants' offices are located in Fresno, California. (See Local Rule 3-120(d).)

PARTIES

- 7. Named plaintiffs Rafael Marquez Amaro and Jesus Alarcon Urzua are residents of Fresno County, California. Plaintiffs are or were agricultural workers, within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. §1802(10), and are or were employed at GERAWAN, within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. §1802(3), to work in Defendants' agricultural fields in or near Fresno, Madera and Tulare counties in California at various times from four (4) years prior to the filing of this action to the present ("the relevant period").
- 8. Plaintiff Rafael Marquez Amaro has worked for Defendants as a field worker since in or around October, 2011. Each year thereafter during the relevant period, GERAWAN hired him at the beginning of the pruning season, around December, and laid him off at the end of the grape harvest season, around November. GERAWAN also laid him off and rehired him, from time to time, between the various table grape seasons (e.g., pruning, tying, and harvesting), and between the tree fruit harvest seasons.

- 9. Plaintiff Jesus Alarcon Urzua has worked for Defendants as a field worker since in or around April, 2012. During the relevant period, GERAWAN hired him at the beginning of the thinning season, around April, and laid him off at the end of the grape harvest season, around November. GERAWAN also laid him off and rehired him, from time to time, between the various table grape seasons (e.g., pruning, tying, and harvesting) and during the tree fruit seasons.
- 10. Defendant GERAWAN FARMING, INC. is a California Corporation that maintains its executive office in Fresno County, California. Defendant GERAWAN FARMING PARTNERS, INC. is a California Corporation that maintains its executive office in Fresno County, California, at the same address used by Defendant GERAWAN FARMING, INC. Defendants employ field workers and other employees to work in Defendants' agricultural fields in or near Fresno, Madera, and Tulare counties in California.
- 11. Plaintiffs are ignorant of the true name, capacity, relationship and extent of participation in the conduct herein alleged of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 10, but are informed and believe and thereon allege that said Defendants are legally responsible for the wrongful conduct alleged herein and therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.
 - 12. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that each

Defendant acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants, and/or carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and/or the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 13. Plaintiffs and the Class are, and at all times pertinent hereto, have been non-exempt employees within the meaning of the California Labor Code, and the implementing rules and regulations of the IWC California Wage Orders.
- 14. During the relevant period, GERAWAN has cultivated, harvested, packed, and shipped agricultural commodities including table grapes and tree fruit on agricultural land located in or near Fresno, Madera, and Tulare Counties, California, for fresh market sale. GERAWAN sells and ships its agricultural produce to various parts of California and other states of the United States.
- 15. During the relevant period GERAWAN has employed, as that term is used in 29 U.S.C. §1892(3), thousands of seasonal agricultural workers in its pruning, tying, thinning, harvesting, and field packing and packaging operations.
- 16. During the relevant period, many of Defendants' field workers have quit their employment, or been laid off, during or between the various table grape and tree fruit seasons.
 - 17. During the relevant class period, Named Plaintiffs and the class they

represent have engaged in agricultural employment, as that term is used in 29 U.S.C. §1802(3), on agricultural land owned or operated by Defendants.

- 18. During the relevant period, Plaintiffs and the Class they represent have entered into working arrangements with Defendants. These arrangements are formed and entered into each season, at or near the time each of the Named Plaintiffs and other workers are hired by Defendants.
- 19. Under the working arrangements, which are also oral employment contracts, Defendants offered Plaintiffs and other agricultural workers jobs in their agricultural operations, and Plaintiffs and other agricultural workers accepted the job offers. By words, conduct, practice, or custom and usage, it is understood by the Defendants and the workers that Defendants will pay the workers an hourly rate for certain services performed and a piece rate based on production for other services. In addition, by words, conduct, practice, or custom and usage, including but not limited to posting the applicable California IWC Wage Order at the place of employment, Defendants communicated to employees that they would follow California's wage order and laws.
- 20. Said contracts are and were working arrangements as that term is used in the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act, 29 U.S.C. §1932(c). Said contracts required Defendants to pay Plaintiffs and the Class their agreed-upon wages for all hours worked or pieces performed.
 - 21. During the relevant period, Defendants have failed to pay all wages due

to Plaintiff and the Class. Specifically, Defendants have failed to pay their field
workers in the table grape operations, and other operations, the proper minimum
wages, failed to pay all wages due, and failed to pay overtime compensation when
paid in whole or part by piece rate.

- 22. During the relevant period, Plaintiffs and the Class worked over ten(10) hours per day, but were not paid overtime for piece rate work at premium rates.
- 23. During the relevant period, Plaintiffs and the Class worked over three and ½ hours per day and were not provided paid rest breaks when paid by the piece.
- 24. Plaintiffs and the members of the Class were at times paid subminimum wage when paid by piece rate.
- 25. Plaintiffs and the members of the Class were not paid all wages due when paid by piece rate.
- 26. The failure to pay this compensation was knowing and willful and is apparent from reviewing the pay stubs provided by Defendants.
- 27. Plaintiffs and the Class are covered by California Industrial Welfare Commission Occupational Wage Order No. 14-2001, California Industrial Welfare Commission in No. 14 (Title 8 Cal. Code of Reg. §§11140).

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

28. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated as a Class Action pursuant to Rule 23(a) and 23(b)(3) of the F.R.C.P. Plaintiffs satisfy the requirements of Rule 23(a) and (b)(3) for the

prosecution of this action as a class action. Plaintiffs seek to represent a Class

 composed of and defined as follows:

All persons who are employed or have been employed by

All persons who are employed or have been employed by GERAWAN, and who have worked one or more shifts as a non-exempt hourly field worker and paid by piece rate in the State of California since four (4) years prior to the filing of this action.

29. Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend or modify the Class description with greater specificity or further division into subclasses or limitation to particular issues.

A. <u>Numerosity</u>

- 30. The potential members of the Class as defined are so numerous that joinder of all the members of the Class is impracticable. While the precise number of Class Members has not been determined at this time, Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants, during the relevant period, employed over 10,000 agricultural workers.
- 31. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' employment records would provide information as to the number and location of all Class Members. Joinder of all members of the proposed Class is not practicable.

B. Commonality

32. There are questions of law and fact common to the Class that predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class Members. These common questions of law and fact include, without limitation:

- (a) Whether Defendants violated the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act, 29 U.S.C. §1801 et seq. ("AWPA") by failing to pay proper wages due to class members for all hours worked.
- (b) Whether Defendants accurately paid minimum wages for all hours worked;
- (c) Whether Defendants accurately paid all wages due for all hours worked;
- (d) Whether Defendants failed to pay overtime compensation for all hours worked;
- (e) Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §226.7, Wage Order 14-2001 or other IWC Wage Orders by failing to provide paid, duty free rest periods for every four (4) hours or major fraction thereof worked or failing to compensate said employees one (1) hours wages in lieu of rest periods;
- (f) Whether Defendants violated §\$201-203 of the Labor Code by failing to pay compensation due and owing at the time that any Class member's employment with Defendants terminated;
- (g) Whether Defendants violated §17200 et seq. of the Business & Professions Code by engaging in the acts previously alleged; and
- (h) Whether Plaintiffs and the members of the Class are entitled to equitable relief pursuant to Business & Professions Code §17200, et. seq.

C. Typicality

- 33. The claims of the Named Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Class.
- 34. Plaintiffs are members of the Class. Plaintiffs are currently, or were formerly employed by Defendants and were subjected to the same unlawful practices as other field workers. Plaintiffs and other members of the Class suffered the same injuries and seek the same relief

D. Adequacy of Representation

35. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the members of the Class. Counsel for Plaintiffs are competent and experienced in litigating large employment class actions.

E. Predominance and Superiority of Class Action

- 36. A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all Class Members is not practicable, and questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class.
- 37. Class action treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system. Plaintiffs are unaware of any difficulties that are likely to be encountered in the management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action.

38. Class action treatment will allow a large number of similarly situated agricultural employees to prosecute their common claims in a single forum, simultaneously, efficiently, and without the unnecessary duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would require. Further, the monetary amounts due to many individual class members are likely to be relatively small, and the burden and expense of individual litigation would make it difficult or impossible for individual class members to seek and obtain relief. Moreover, Plaintiffs are seasonal agricultural workers who are unlikely to be able to bring individual actions to recover their claims. A class action will serve an important public interest by permitting employees harmed by Defendants' unlawful practices to effectively pursue recovery of the sums owed to them.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF MIGRANT AND SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL WORKERPROTECTION ACT

- 39. Plaintiffs incorporate each and every allegation set forth in all of the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 40. Defendants intentionally violated the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act by:
- (a) failing to pay wages when due to Plaintiffs and the Class, as required by 29 U.S.C. §1832(a);

- (b) failing to post a notice setting forth the rights and protections provided by the Act, as required by 29 U.S.C. §1831(b); and
- (c) violating the terms of the working arrangements made with Plaintiffs and the Class, in violation of 29 U.S.C. §1832(c).

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIMEAND ALL WAGES DUE PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE

- 41. Plaintiffs incorporate each and every allegation set forth in all of the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 42. By their policy of requiring non-exempt employees to work in excess of ten (10) hours in a workday and/or sixty (60) hours in a workweek without compensating such employee at a rate of (1 1/2) their regular rate as alleged,

 Defendants have violated the California Labor Code.
- 43. Labor Code §1194 establishes an employee's right to recover unpaid wages, including overtime compensation and interest thereon, together with the costs of suit. Cal. Lab. Code §1198 further states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.
- 44. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Plaintiffs and the Class have been deprived of wages and overtime in amounts to be determined at trial, and

are entitled to recovery of such amounts, plus interest and penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs, pursuant to Labor Code § 1194.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES

- 45. Plaintiffs incorporate each and every allegation set forth in all of the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 46. Labor Code § 1194 requires an employer to pay the unpaid balance of any minimum wage that was not paid to an employee. Employees are entitled to minimum wages for each hour of work.
- 47. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and the Class with minimum wage compensation by failing to pay them properly for all hours worked. This happened when Plaintiffs earned a total compensation of less than \$8.00 an hour for each and every hour worked in a specific day when they were paid in whole or part by piece.
- 48. Pursuant to the California Labor Code, Plaintiffs are entitled to recover all wages due for all hours that were not compensated at the minimum wage rate, in a sum to be proven at trial, plus liquidated damages in the same amount.
- 49. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194.2, Plaintiffs request that the court award interest, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs incurred in this action.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO COMPENSATE FOR REST BREAKS PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE §226.7 AND WAGE ORDER 14-2001

- 50. Plaintiffs incorporate each and every allegation set forth in all of the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 51. Labor Code §226.7 and IWC Wage Order 14-2001 require an employer to provide paid rest periods or to pay an additional hour (1) of compensation for each paid rest period the employer fails to provide. Employees are entitled to a paid ten (10) minute rest break for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof.
- 52. Plaintiffs and the Class consistently worked over 3 ½ hours without being provided with paid rest breaks while working on a piece rate basis during the relevant period.
- 53. Pursuant to Labor Code §226.7, Plaintiffs are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one (1) hour of wages per missed paid rest break in a sum to be proven at trial.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PENALTIES PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 203

- 54. Plaintiffs incorporate each and every allegation set forth in all of the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein
 - 55. California Labor Code Section 203 provides, in relevant part:

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 therefore is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days.

56. By willfully failing to pay wages due to Plaintiffs and the Class each time they were discharged, laid off, or quit, in accordance with California Labor Code §§201, 202, and 205.5, Defendants have violated California Labor Code §203. The wages of Plaintiffs and the Class should thus continue as a penalty for an additional 30 days.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200

- 57. Plaintiffs incorporate each and every allegation set forth in all of the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein
- 58. California Business and Professions Code Section 17200 et seq. provides, in relevant part, that "unfair competition shall mean and include any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice..."
- 59. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and on behalf of the Class described above, and on behalf of the general public pursuant to § 17204 of the California Business & Professions Code.

60.	In California,	there is a fundamental	and substantial public polic	ey E
protecting	g an employee's	wages.		

- 61. The following practices of Defendants are unlawful, and unfair business practices under California Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq.:
- (a) underpaying workers, including Plaintiffs, in violation of the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Workers Protection Act, 29 U.S.C. § 1832(c); California Labor Code §§ 200, 205.5, 221, 223, 1194, 1197; the California Code of Regulations Tit. 8, § 11140, IWC Wage Order 14; and fundamental public policy of the State of California;
 - (b) failing to provide paid rest periods to workers, including Plaintiffs;
- (c) retaining the benefit of the labor performed by workers, including Plaintiffs, without reasonable compensation;
- (d) failing to promptly pay all wages due to workers, including Plaintiffs, when they were discharged, laid off or quit, in violation of the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Workers Protection Act, 29 U.S.C. § 1832(c); and California Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 205.5; and
- (e) paying workers, including Plaintiffs, less than the minimum wage, in violation of AWPA, 29 U.S.C. § 1832(c); California Labor Code §1197 and IWC Wage Order 14;
 - 62. The unlawful, and unfair acts described herein present a continuing

threat to the general public which cannot be adequately remedied at law. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that such conduct will continue unless enjoined by this Court pursuant to § 17203 of the Business and Professions Code.

63. The limitations period under the Business and Professions Code § 17208, is four years. Accordingly, Plaintiffs seek relief for the period going back four years prior to the filing of this Complaint and continuing into the present until judgment is entered.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

- 1. Damages in an amount equal to all unpaid minimum wages, unpaid wages, and overtime wages owed to Plaintiffs and the Class for three years prior to the filing of this Complaint;
- 2. Restitution of Plaintiffs' and the Class's unpaid wages and overtime under Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq., for four years prior to the filing of this Complaint;
- 3. Liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code §1194 for three years prior to the filing of this Complaint;
- 4. Monetary damages to Plaintiffs and the Class, pursuant to the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act, 29 U.S.C. § 1854(c), in an amount equal to their actual damages or their statutory damages of up to \$500.00

per Class Member per violation, whichever is greater;

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27 28

An award of statutory waiting-time penalties equal to 30-days' wages, 5. pursuant to California Labor Code § 203, to Plaintiffs and the Class, each time such Class Member was discharged, quit, or laid off, including but not limited to each time each employee was discharged because of an end-of-season layoff, in accordance with California Labor Code Sections 201, 202 and 205.5 for three years prior to the filing of the Complaint;

- 6. Monetary damages pursuant to paragraph 18 of California Code of Regulations Tit. 8, Section 11140, IWC Wage Order 14;
- 7. A declaration that Defendants intentionally violated the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act, 29 U.S.C. § 1801 et seq.;
- Injunctive relief, including an order enjoining Defendants from 8. continuing ongoing violations of the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act, and other injunctive relief as provided under California Business & Professions Code §17200 et seq.;
- Reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred by Plaintiffs on behalf of 9. themselves and the Class in the prosecution of this action pursuant to applicable law, including without limitation, California Labor Code Section 218.5, 226, and 1194 and California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5;
- Pre- and post-judgment interest at the maximum legal rate of interest for each item of damages listed above; and

	Case 1:14-at-00065 Document 1-1 Filed 02/03/14 Page 19 of 19
1	11. Such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.
2	
3	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
4	Plaintiffs demand trial by jury.
5	
6	DATED: February 3, 2014 KINGSLEY & KINGSLEY, APC
7	
8	By: / <u>s/ ERIC B. KINGSLEY</u> ERIC B. KINGSLEY
9	ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFFS
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16 17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
2 7	
28	
	19 CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT