			· ·
			9/387
1	BOREN, OSHER & LUFTMAN LLP		9/387
2	Paul K. Haines (SBN 248226) Email: phaines@bollaw.com		/
3	Fletcher W. Schmidt (SBN 286462)   Email: fschmidt@bollaw.com		FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles
4	222 N. Sepulveda Blvd., Suite 2222 El Segundo, California 90245		FEB 1 7 2015
5	Tel: (310) 322-2220 Fax: (310) 322-2228		Sherri R. Carter, Exacutive Officer/Clerk
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Classes		By digence Bettion Deputy
7	D-322 WILLIAM F	· /H	16 HBERGER
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE	STA'	TE OF CALIFORNIA
9	COUNTY OF LO	)S Al	NGELES
10	,		BC 5 7 2 7 6 7
11	SAMUEL CASTILLO, as an individual and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	CAS	SE NO.
12	Sociali of all others similarly situated,	CL	ASS ACTION COMPLAINT
13	Plaintiff,	(1)	MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS (LABOR CODE
14	vs.		§§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197);
15	CALIBER BODYWORKS OF TEXAS, INC., a Texas Corporation, and DOES 1 through 10,	(2)	FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME WAGES (LABOR
16			CODE §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, 1198);
17	Defendants.	(3)	WAITING TIME PENALTIES
18			(LABOR CODE §§ 201 – 203);
19		(4)	UNFAIR COMPETITION (BUS & PROF CODE § 17200
20			et seq.);
21		(5)	WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS (LABOR CODE
22			§ 226 et seq.);
23		(6)	REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS⊇ ≤ ≓ \$
24			AND 556);
25	) 5	(7)	EMPLOYEES FOR NECESSARY
26			S§2802 & 2804);
27	1		
28			MAND FOR JURY TRIAL # ##################################
	1		\$0. 0. 0. 3. 7. 8. 8. 8.

Class Action Complaint

5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff Samuel Castillo ("Plaintiff") on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby brings this Class Action Complaint against Defendants Caliber Bodyworks of Texas, Inc., a Texas Corporation, and DOES 1 through 10 (collectively "Defendants"), inclusive, and on information and belief alleges as follows:

#### **JURISDICTION**

1. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby brings this class action for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under California Business and Professions Code §17200, et. seq., California Labor Code §§ 201-204, 210, 216, 226, 226.3, 510, 516, 558, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, 2802, and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order No. 4-2001, in addition to seeking restitution. This class action is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure 382. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code because the amount in controversy exceeds this Court's jurisdictional minimum.

#### **VENUE**

2. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this judicial district pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 395(a) and 395.5, as at least some of the acts and omissions complained of hereon occurred in the County of Los Angeles. Further, Plaintiff does now, and at all times relevant herein did, reside in Los Angeles County and was employed by Defendants within Los Angeles County.

#### **PARTIES**

3. Plaintiff is an individual over the age of eighteen (18). At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff was and currently is a California resident, residing in the county of Los Angeles. During the four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint in this action and within the statute of limitations periods applicable to each cause of action pled herein, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as an hourly non-exempt employee. Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants' policies and/or practices complained of herein, lost money and/or property, and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed to him by California Labor Code §§ 201-204, 210, 216, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 516, 558, 1174, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198,

2698 et seq., 2802, California Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq. (Unfair Competition), and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order No. 4-2001 (hereinafter "Wage Order 4"), which sets employment standards for the automobile dealership industry.

- 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the four years preceding the filing of the Complaint and continuing to the present, Defendants did (and do) business by operating various automobile dealerships and accompanying service stations throughout Los Angeles, California, and employed Plaintiff and other, similarly-situated hourly non-exempt employees within Los Angeles County as mechanics, auto technicians, and similarly titled positions and, therefore, were (and are) doing business in Los Angeles County and the State of California.
- 5. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, Defendant Caliber Bodyworks of Texas, Inc., a Texas corporation, is licensed to do business in California and the County of Los Angeles.
- 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, Defendants were licensed to do business in California and the County of Los Angeles, and were the employers of Plaintiff and the Classes (as defined in Paragraph 18).
- 7. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or corporate, of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 10, inclusive, and for that reason, said Defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious Defendants, whether individual, partners, agents, or corporate, was responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein, and proximately caused Plaintiff and the Classes to be subject to the unlawful employment practices, wrongs, injuries and damages complained of herein.
- 8. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants; and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each and every one of the other Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned were acting within the course

and scope of said agency and employment. Defendants, and each of them, approved of, condoned, and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts or omissions complained of herein.

9. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of and engaged in a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course and scope of and in pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise. Further, Plaintiff alleges that all Defendants were joint employers for all purposes of Plaintiff and all Class Members.

## **GENERAL FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 10. From approximately 2007 to January 2015, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in the positions of an automobile technician or mechanic in Santa Clarita, California.
- 11. During Plaintiff's employment, Plaintiff was paid on a piece-rate (or flag-rate) system for each task that he performed. Plaintiff was paid the assigned piece-rate hours per task, regardless of the time it actually took him to perform such tasks. For example, if a task were assigned a value of .8 hours, Plaintiff would be paid .8 hours for performing this task irrespective of whether it took him 10 minutes or 90 minutes to perform the task.
- 12. Although Plaintiff recorded his hours worked during his employment, he was only paid per the piece-rate system described in the preceding paragraph. As a result, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff for all hours worked at the minimum wage, as Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for non-productive hours, i.e., hours that he was not performing piece-rate work. Rather, Defendants attempted to use an averaging method of meeting their minimum wage obligations (i.e., dividing daily piece-rate earnings by daily hours worked), which is funlawful under California law.
- 13. In addition, Defendants paid Plaintiff non-discretionary bonuses such as (called Csep Q Bonus"), and other forms of compensation that are not excludable from the regular rate of pay (hereinafter "Incentive Pay").

- 14. Despite Defendants' payment of Incentive Pay to Plaintiff, Defendants failed to include all forms of Incentive Pay when calculating Plaintiff's regular rate of pay, thereby further causing Plaintiff to be underpaid all of his required overtime wages. Therefore, although Plaintiff routinely worked more than eight hours per work day and/or more than forty hours per work week, he did not receive overtime compensation equal to one and a half times his regular rate of pay for working overtime hours.
- 15. Moreover, as a result of only paying Plaintiff for piece-rate work performed, Defendants failed to maintain any compensation system of compensating for rest periods, because Defendants did not "separately compensate [putative class members] for rest periods." Bluford v. Safeway Inc., 216 Cal. App. 4th 864 (2013) ("There is no dispute that Safeway's activity-based compensation system did not separately compensate drivers for their rest periods.").
- 16. Defendants also required Plaintiff and the other Class Members to purchase tools that were required to perform their job duties and other reasonable and necessary work expenditures, but failed to reimburse them for these tools which were necessary for the performance of their job duties.
- 17. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay all overtime and minimum wages, Defendants maintained inaccurate payroll records and issued inaccurate wage statements to Plaintiff.

#### **CLASS DEFINITIONS**

- 18. Class Definition: Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the following Classes pursuant to Section 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure:
- a. The Minimum Wage Class consists of all Defendants' current and former hourly non-exempt employees in California who worked as mechanics, auto technicians, or in similarly titled positions, and were compensated according to Defendants' piece-rate compensation system, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint through the apresent.

- b. The Overtime Class consists of all Defendants' current and former hourly non-exempt employees in California who worked as mechanics, auto technicians, or in similarly titled positions, and who were not paid for all overtime hours worked due to: (a) Defendants' piece-rate compensation system; and/or (b) their receipt of Incentive Pay and overtime compensation in a corresponding time period, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint through the present.
- c. The Employee Expense Class consists of all Defendants' current and former hourly non-exempt employees in California who worked as mechanics, auto technicians, or in similarly titled positions, and who were required to purchase tools, and other reasonable and necessary work expenditures without reimbursement during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint through the present date.
- d. The Waiting Time Penalty Class consists of Defendants' formerly employed members of the: (1) Minimum Wage Class, whom Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked, due to Defendants' piece-rate compensation system; and/or (2) Overtime Class, who were not paid for all overtime hours worked due to: (a) Defendants' piece-rate compensation system; and/or (b) their receipt of Incentive Pay and overtime compensation in a corresponding time period, and who separated from employment during the three years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint through the present.
- e. The Wage Statement Class consists of the members of the: (1) Minimum Wage Class, whom Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked, due to Defendants' piece-rate compensation system; and/or (2) Overtime Class, who were not paid for all overtime hours worked due to: (a) Defendants' piece-rate compensation system; and/or (b) their receipt of Incentive Pay and overtime compensation in a corresponding time period, during the one year immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint through the present.
- f. The Rest Period Class consists of all Defendants' current and former hourly nonexempt employees in California who worked as mechanics or in similarly titled positions, and were compensated according to Defendants' piece-rate compensation system, and who worked

a shift in excess of 3.5 hours, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint through the present.

- 19. Numerosity/Ascertainability: The members of the Classes are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and not practicable. The membership of the classes and subclasses are unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, it is estimated that the Classes number greater than one hundred (100) individuals as to each Class. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants' employment records.
- 20. Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well Defined Community of Interest: There are common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and all other similarly situated employees, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members including, without limitation to:
- a. Whether Defendants violated the applicable Labor Code provisions including, but not limited to §§510 and1194 by requiring overtime work and not paying for said work according to the overtime laws of the State of California;
- b. Whether Defendants failed to properly include all forms of compensation when computing the respective regular rates for members of the Overtime Class;
- c. Whether Defendants' policies and/or practices for determining the regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation to the Overtime Class violated California law;
- d. Whether Defendants' piece-rate compensation system failed to pay members of the Minimum Wage Class for all hours worked;
- e. Whether Defendants' policies and/or practices for the timing and amount of payment of final wages to members of the Waiting Time Class at the time of separation from employment were unlawful;
- f. Whether Defendants' policies and/or practices caused Plaintiff and the Employee Expense Class to not be reimbursed for all necessary work expenditures.
- 18. **Predominance of Common Questions:** Common questions of law and fact predominate over questions that affect only individual members of the Classes. The common questions of law set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendants'

policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member, such as their uniform compensation system of compensating members of the Minimum Wage Class on a piece-rate basis only, and uniform method of calculating overtime payments for the members of the Overtime Class. As such, these common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual class member's showing as to his or her eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of his or her damages.

- 22. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Classes because Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the statutes of limitation applicable to each cause of action pled in the Complaint in this action. As alleged herein, Plaintiff, like the members of the Classes, was deprived of all minimum and overtime wages, and was not paid all wages owed at the time of termination.
- 23. Adequacy of Representation: Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary steps to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the members of the Classes. Moreover, Plaintiff's attorneys are ready, willing and able to fully and adequately represent the members of the Classes and Plaintiff. Plaintiff's attorneys have prosecuted and defended numerous wage-and-hour class actions in state and federal courts in the past and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the members of the classes.
- 24. **Superiority:** The California Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves an important public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California. These laws and labor standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers who have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to take advantage of superior economic and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of employment. The nature of this action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff and members of the Classes make the class action format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to redress the violations alleged herein. If each employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily gain an unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources. Moreover, requiring each

member of the Classes to pursue an individual remedy would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file an action against their former and/or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent damages to their careers at subsequent employment. Further, the prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members, even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; and which would establish potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or legal determinations with respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interest of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which would substantially impair or impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. Further, the claims of the individual members of the class are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual prosecution considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending thereto.

25. As such, the Classes identified in Paragraph 18 are maintainable under Section 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

#### **FIRST CLAIM**

#### FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES

- 26. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 25 as though fully set forth herein.
- 27. Wage Order 4, § 4 and California Labor Code §§ 1197 and 1182.12 establish the right of employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state law. Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal minimum wage as required by Labor Code § 1197 may recover the unpaid balance together with attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid wages and interest accrued thereon.
- 28. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to conform their pay practices to the requirements of the law. This unlawful conduct includes, but is not limited to Defendants'

uniform piece-rate compensation structure for members of the Minimum Wage Class, which resulted in these individuals only being paid on Defendants' piece-rate system, as opposed to being paid for all hours worked. As a result, Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class were not paid for all hours worked. Accordingly, Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class were not compensated for all hours worked including, but not limited to, all hours they were subject to the control of Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the California Labor Code and Wage Order 4.

- 29. Defendants' policy and practice of not paying all minimum wages violates California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 216, 558, 1182.12, 1197.1, 1198, and Wage Order 4.
- 30. Such a practice and uniform administration of corporate policy regarding illegal employee compensation is unlawful and creates an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of minimum wages, liquidated damages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, civil penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 216, 558, 1194 et seq., 1194.2, 1198, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.
- 31. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of minimum wages, Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class seek penalties pursuant to Wage Order 4, § 20(A) and California Labor Code § 1199; interest pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.6 and 1194 and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289; liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194 et seq. 1194.2; and attorneys' fees and costs of suit pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194 et seq.

#### **SECOND CLAIM**

# FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES

- 32. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 31 as though fully set forth herein.
- 33. This cause of action is brought on behalf of the Overtime Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198, which provide that hourly non-exempt employees are entitled to all overtime wages and compensation for hours worked, and provide a

private right of action for the failure to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

- Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class worked overtime hours and were paid various forms of Incentive Pay, which are not statutory exclusions when calculating an employee's regular rate. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly compensate non-exempt employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class, for all overtime hours worked pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194 and Wage Order 4. Wage Order 4, § 3 requires an employer to pay an employee "one and one-half (1½) times the employee's regular rate of pay" for work in excess of 8 hours per work day and/or in excess of 40 hours of work in the workweek. Wage Order 4, § 3 also requires an employer to pay an employee double the employee's regular rate of pay for work in excess of 12 hours each work day and/or for work in excess of 8 hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in the workweek.
- 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that, Defendants regularly and systematically, as a policy and practice, miscalculated the overtime rate of pay by failing to properly include the various forms of Incentive Pay paid to Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class, which are not statutory exclusions when calculating an employee's regular rate of pay. Rather, Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class were only paid one-and-a-half times their base rate, which was not equal to the regular rate, as Defendants failed to include the various forms of Incentive Pay earned during corresponding periods that were required to be included in the regular rate, but were not. Accordingly, Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class were not compensated at the appropriate rates of overtime pay for all hours worked. Moreover, Defendants' piece-rate compensation system resulted in these individuals not being compensated for all hours worked, nor were they compensated for all hours worked.
- Defendants' policy and practice of requiring overtime work and not paying at the proper overtime rates for said work violates California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 216, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198, and Wage Order 4.

24.25

- 37. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the job duties and responsibilities of the Overtime Class are irrelevant because Plaintiff and all others similarly situated merely allege wrongdoing with Defendants' pay policies and practices as to calculating the applicable overtime rates of pay for overtime worked by members of the Overtime Class.
- 38. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of overtime premiums owing, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, civil penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 216, 510, 558, 1194, 1198, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

#### **THIRD CLAIM**

#### WAITING TIME PENALTIES

- 39. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 38 as though fully set forth herein.
- 40. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201-203 which require an employer to pay all wages immediately at the time of termination of employment in the event the employer discharges the employee or the employee provides at least 72 hours of notice of his/her intent to quit. In the event the employee provides less than 72 hours of notice of his/her intent to quit, said employee's wages become due and payable not later than 72 hours upon said employee's last date of employment.
- 41. Defendants failed to timely pay Plaintiff all of his final wages at the time of termination which includes, among other things, underpaid minimum and overtime wages. Further, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that as a matter of uniform policy and practice, Defendants continue to fail to pay members of the Waiting Time Class all earned wages at the end of employment in a timely manner pursuant to the requirements of Labor Code §§ 201-203. Defendants' failure to pay all final wages was willful within the meaning of Labor Code § 203.

22<sup>†</sup>

23<sub>+</sub>

42. Defendants' wilful failure to timely pay Plaintiff and the members of the Waiting Time Class their earned wages upon separation from employment results in a continued payment of wages up to thirty (30) days from the time the wages were due. Therefore, Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Class are entitled to compensation pursuant to Labor Code § 203, plus reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

#### **FOURTH CLAIM**

#### UNFAIR COMPETITION

- 43. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 42 as though fully set forth herein.
- 44. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business practices in California in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq., by: (a) failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class all minimum wages owed due to their piece-rate compensation system; (b) failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class all overtime wages owed due to miscalculation of the regular rate; (c) wilfully failing to timely pay Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Class all final wages upon termination of employment; and (d) failing to reimburse employees of the Employee Expense Class for all reasonable work expenditures.
- 45. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived Plaintiff and continues to deprive members of the Classes of compensation to which they are legally entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage over Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers and attempting to do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws.
- 46. Because Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff for himself and on behalf of the members of the Classes, seeks full restitution of monies, as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired and/or converted by the Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17208.

- 47. The acts complained of herein occurred within the last four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint in this action.
- 48. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to protect his interests and those of the Classes, to obtain restitution, to secure injunctive relief on behalf of Defendants' current hourly non-exempt employees, and to enforce important rights affecting the public interest. Plaintiff thereby incurred the financial burden of attorneys' fees and costs, which he is entitled to recover under Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

## FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

## WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS

## (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 49. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 48 as though fully set forth herein.
- 50. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that, Defendants knowingly and intentionally, as a matter of uniform policy and practice, failed to furnish him and members of the Wage Statement Class with accurate and complete wage statements regarding their correct number of regular, overtime and double-time hours worked, regular rates of pay, rates of overtime pay and gross and net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226.
- 51. Defendants' failure to furnish Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Class with complete and accurate itemized wage statements resulted in actual injury, as said failures led to, among other things, the non-payment of all their overtime wages, and deprived them of the information necessary to identify the discrepancies in Defendants' reported data.
- 52. Defendants' failures create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Class in a civil action for all damages and/or penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226, including statutory penalties, civil penalties, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code §§ 226 and 226.3.

## **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS** 

53.

though fully set forth herein.

54. Wage Order 4, § 12 and California Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516 and 558 estable

Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 52 as

- 54. Wage Order 4, § 12 and California Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516 and 558 establish the right of employees to have made available to them a rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour period worked, or major fraction thereof.
- 55. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants failed to make rest periods available to all putative class members by failing to maintain a legally compliant class-wide rest period policy that separately compensates employees for rest periods in light of Defendants' piece-rate compensation system.
- 56. As a result of Defendants' failure to maintain a legally compliant rest period policy to compensate for rest periods, Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class were not provided with all rest periods to which they were entitled under California law. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants did not pay an additional hour of pay to Plaintiff and the Rest Period Class at their regular rate of pay as required by Labor Code section 226.7.
- 57. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of rest period premiums owing, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, civil penalties, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and Civil Code §§ 3287(b) and 3289.

#### **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

# FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR NECESSARY EXPENDITURES (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 58. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 57 as though fully set forth herein.
- 59. Based on information and belief, Defendants required Plaintiff and members of the Employee Expense Class to purchase necessary tools without compensating these employees for such necessary work expenditures. Although Plaintiff and members of the Employee Expense Class did not earn more than twice the minimum wage during the four years

60. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code § 2802,

preceding the filing of the Complaint, Defendants did not reimburse them for these expenses.

which states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or obedience to the directions of the employer."

- 61. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code § 2804, which states that "any contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to waive the benefits of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall not deprive any employee or his personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled under the laws of this State.
- 62. As a proximate result of Defendants' policies and/or practices in violation of Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2804, and Wage Order 9-2001, § 9, Plaintiff and members of the Employee Expense Class were damaged in sums, which will be shown according to proof.
- 63. Plaintiff and members of the Employee Expense Class are entitled to attorneys' fees and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(c) for bringing this action. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(b), any action brought for the reimbursement of necessary expenditures carries interest at the same rate as judgments in civil actions. Thus, Plaintiff and members of the Employee Expense Class are entitled to interest, which shall accrue from the date on which they incurred the necessary expenditure.

#### **PRAYER**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for themselves and for all others on whose behalf this suit is brought against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

- 1. For an order certifying the proposed Classes;
- 2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the Classes;
- 3. For an order appointing Counsel for Plaintiff as Counsel for the Classes;
- 4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for payment of minimum wages, liquidated damages, and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 558, 1194, 1194.2 and 1199;

- 5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
- 6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for statutory waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203;
- 7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for injunctive relief and restitution to Plaintiff and members of the Classes of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or practices declared by this Court to be in violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq.;
- 8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226;
- 9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action for compensatory, consequential, general and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516 and 558;
- 10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2804;
- 11. Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to California Labor Code § 218.6 and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289;
- 12. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code §§ 226, 1194 et seq., 2802, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.
- 13. For such other and further relief the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: February 17, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

BOREN, OSHER & LUFTMAN LLP

By:

Paul K. Haines

Attorneys for Plaintiff

# **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial with respect to all issues triable by jury.

Dated: February 17, 2015

BOREN, OSHER & LUFTMAN LLP

By:

Paul K. Haines
Attorneys for Plaintiff

		CM-010
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar n Paul K. Haines (SBN 248226)	number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY
Boren, Osher & Luftman, LLP		FILED
222 N. Sepulveda Blvd., Suite 2222		Superior Court of California
El Segundo, CA 90245		County of Los Angeles
TELEPHONE NO.: 310-322-2220 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff Samuel Casti	FAX NO.: 310-322-2228	
		FEB 17 <b>2015</b>
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LO STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street	s Angeles	Out of Evoqueur Officer/Clark
MAILING ADDRESS: Same		Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, 90012		By <u>Myrna Beltran</u> Deputy Myrna Beltran
BRANCH NAME: Central		Wyma Deman
CASE NAME:		<del></del>
Samuel Castillo v. Caliber Bodywork	cs of Texas Inc	
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	<del></del>	CASE NUMBER:
✓ Unlimited Limited	Complex Case Designation	DO C No m o
(Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder	BC 5 7 2 7 6 7
demanded demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defen	dant JUDGE:
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	
Items 1–6 beld	ow must be completed (see instructions	on page 2).
1. Check one box below for the case type that	best describes this case:	
Auto Tort	Contract	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation
Auto (22)	Breach of contract/warranty (06)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400–3.403)
Uninsured motorist (46)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property	Other collections (09)	Construction defect (10)
Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Insurance coverage (18)	Mass tort (40)
Asbestos (04)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)
Product liability (24)	Real Property	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)
Medical malpractice (45)	Eminent domain/Inverse	Insurance coverage claims arising from the
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	condemnation (14)	above listed provisionally complex case
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	types (41)
Business tort/unfair business practice (07)	Other real property (26)	Enforcement of Judgment
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	RICO (27)
Intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38)	
Professional negligence (25)	Judicial Review	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05)	Miscellaneous Civil Petition
Employment :	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)
Wrongful termination (36)	Writ of mandate (02)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ules of Court If the cose is complete most the
factors requiring exceptional judicial manage	nex under rule 3.400 of the Camornia K nement:	ules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the
a. Large number of separately repres		er of witnesses
b. Extensive motion practice raising of		with related actions pending in one or more courts
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ties, states, or countries, or in a federal court
<u>~`</u> [		ostjudgment judicial supervision
M.	<u> </u>	
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a.[		declaratory or injunctive relief c. punitive
4. Number of causes of action (specify): 7: 1	Minimum Wage Violations, Faile	ure to Pay All Overtime Wages, etc.
5. This case ✓ is ☐ is not a class	s action suit.	
6. If there are any known related cases, file at	nd serve a notice of related case. (You	may use form CM-015.)
Date: February 17, 2015		$\supset I = I$
Paul K. Haines	-	<del>- 41</del>
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)
	NOTICE	
Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the file this c	rst paper filed in the action or proceeding	ng (except small claims cases or cases filed
under the Probate Code, Family Code, or V in sanctions.	veirare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Ru	les of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result
<ul> <li>File this cover sheet in addition to any cove</li> </ul>	r sheet required by local court rule	
If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et s	seq. of the California Rules of Court, vo	u must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all
other parties to the action or proceeding.		
<ul> <li>Unless this is a collections case under rule</li> </ul>	3.740 or a complex case, this cover she	eet will be used for statistical purposes only.
		Page 1 of 2

#### INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must complete and file, along with your first paper, the Civil Case Cover Sheet contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the primary cause of action. To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court.

To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the Civil Case Cover Sheet to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that the case is complex.

```
Auto Tort
```

Auto (22)-Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the case involves an uninsured motorist claim subject to arbitration, check this item instead of Auto)

## Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/ Property Damage/Wrongful Death)

Asbestos (04)

Asbestos Property Damage Asbestos Personal Injury/ Wrongful Death

Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental) (24)

Medical Malpractice (45)

Medical Malpractice-

Physicians & Surgeons Other Professional Health Care

Malpractice

Other PI/PD/WD (23)

Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)

Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD

(e.g., assault, vandalism)

Intentional Infliction of

**Emotional Distress** 

Negligent Infliction of

**Emotional Distress** 

(C) Other PI/PD/WD

#### Non-RI/PD/WD (Other) Tort

**Business Tort/Unfair Business** 

Practice (07)

Çivil Rights (e.g., discrimination,

false arrest) (not civil

harassment) (08)

Defamation (e.g., slander, libel)

(13)

Fraud (16)

Intellectual Property (19)

Professional Negligence (25)

Legal Malpractice

Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)

Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35)

**Employment** 

Wrongful Termination (36) Other Employment (15)

#### **CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES**

#### Contract

Breach of Contract/Warranty (06)

Breach of Rental/Lease

Contract (not unlawful detainer

or wrongful eviction) Contract/Warranty Breach-Seller

Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence)

Negligent Breach of Contract/

Warranty

Other Breach of Contract/Warranty

Collections (e.g., money owed, open

book accounts) (09)

Collection Case-Seller Plaintiff

Other Promissory Note/Collections

Case

Insurance Coverage (not provisionally

complex) (18)

Auto Subrogation Other Coverage

Other Contract (37) Contractual Fraud

Other Contract Dispute

#### **Real Property**

Eminent Domain/Inverse

Condemnation (14)

Wrongful Eviction (33)

Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26)

Writ of Possession of Real Property

Mortgage Foreclosure

Quiet Title

Other Real Property (not eminent

domain, landlord/tenant, or

foreclosure)

#### **Unlawful Detainer**

Commercial (31)

Residential (32)

Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal drugs, check this item; otherwise,

report as Commercial or Residential)

#### **Judicial Review**

Asset Forfeiture (05)

Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11)

Writ of Mandate (02)

Writ-Administrative Mandamus Writ-Mandamus on Limited Court

Case Matter

Writ-Other Limited Court Case

Review

Other Judicial Review (39)

Review of Health Officer Order

Notice of Appeal-Labor

Commissioner Appeals

# Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal.

Rules of Court Rules 3.400-3.403) Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)

Construction Defect (10)

Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)

Securities Litigation (28)

Environmental/Toxic Tort (30)

Insurance Coverage Claims

(arising from provisionally complex

case type listed above) (41)

#### **Enforcement of Judgment**

Enforcement of Judgment (20)

Abstract of Judgment (Out of

County)

Confession of Judgment (non-

domestic relations) Sister State Judgment

Administrative Agency Award

(not unpaid taxes)

Petition/Certification of Entry of

Judgment on Unpaid Taxes

Other Enforcement of Judgment

#### Miscellaneous Civil Complaint

**RICO (27)** 

Other Complaint (not specified

above) (42)

Declaratory Relief Only Injunctive Relief Only (non-

harassment)

Mechanics Lien Other Commercial Complaint

Case (non-tort/non-complex)

Other Civil Complaint

(non-tort/non-complex)

#### Miscellaneous Civil Petition

Partnership and Corporate

Governance (21) Other Petition (not specified

above) (43)

Civil Harassment

Workplace Violence

Elder/Dependent Adult

Abuse

**Election Contest** 

Petition for Name Change

Petition for Relief From Late

Claim

Other Civil Petition

A

Samuel Castillo v. Caliber Bodyworks of Texas, Inc.

CASE NUMBER C 5 7 2 7 6 7

# CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION (CERTIFICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE LOCATION)

This form is required pursuant to Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil case filings in the Los Angeles Superior Court. Item I. Check the types of hearing and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case: CLASS ACTION? VES LIMITED CASE? YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 5 Item II. Indicate the correct district and courthouse location (4 steps - If you checked "Limited Case", skip to Item III, Pg. 4): Step 1: After first completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet form, find the main Civil Case Cover Sheet heading for your case in the left margin below, and, to the right in Column A, the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected. Step 2: Check one Superior Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the nature of this case. Step 3: In Column C, circle the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action you have checked. For any exception to the court location, see Local Rule 2.0. Applicable Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (see Column C below) Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, central district. Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle.

- May be filed in central (other county, or no bodily injury/property damage).
- Location where cause of action arose.
- Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred.
   Location where performance required or defendant resides.

- Location where petitioner resides.
   Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly.
   Location where one or more of the parties reside.
   Location of Labor Commissioner Office

Step 4: Fill in the information requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration.

Auto Tort	
Other Personal Injury/ Property Damage/Wróngfúl Déath Tork 🗧 🖯	

A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	<b>B</b> Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Auto (22)	□ A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
Uninsured Motorist (46)	□ A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
Asbestos (04)	□ A6070 Asbestos Property Damage □ A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2. 2.
Product Liability (24)	☐ A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
Medical Malpractice (45)	□ A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons □ A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4. 1., 4.
Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	<ul> <li>□ A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)</li> <li>□ A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.)</li> <li>□ A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress</li> <li>□ A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death</li> </ul>	1., 4. 1., 4. 1., 3. 1., 4.

SHORT TITLE:

Samuel Castillo v. Caliber Bodyworks of Texas, Inc.

CASE NUMBER

Α Civil Case Cover Sheet Type of Action Applicable Reasons -Category No. (Check only one) See Step 3 Above Business Tort (07) ☐ A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract) 1., 3. Non-Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort Civil Rights (08) ☐ A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination 1., 2., 3. Defamation (13) ☐ A6010 Defamation (slander/libel) 1., 2., 3. ☐ A6013 Fraud (no contract) Fraud (16) 1., 2., 3. □ A6017 Legal Malpractice 1., 2., 3. Professional Negligence (25) ☐ A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal) 1., 2., 3. Other (35) ☐ A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort 2.,3. Wrongful Termination (36) ☐ A6037 Wrongful Termination 1., 2., 3. ☑ A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case (1.,)2., 3. Other Employment (15) A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals 10. A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful 2., 5. Breach of Contract/ Warranty 2., 5. ☐ A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) (not insurance) 1., 2., 5. ☐ A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) 1., 2., 5. A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence) ☐ A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff 2., 5., 6. Collections (09) ☐ A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case 2., 5. ☐ A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex) Insurance Coverage (18) 1., 2., 5., 8. □ A6009 Contractual Fraud 1., 2., 3., 5. Other Contract (37) ☐ A6031 Tortious Interference 1., 2., 3., 5. A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence) 1., 2., 3., 8. Eminent Domain/Inverse ☐ A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels 2. Condemnation (14) Wrongful Eviction (33) ☐ A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case 2., 6. ☐ A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure 2., 6. Other Real Property (26) ☐ A6032 Quiet Title 2., 6. ☐ A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure) 2., 6. Unlawful Detainer-Commercial ٠, ☐ A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction) 2., 6. (31)Unlawful Detainer-Residential ☐ A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction) 2., 6. (32)Unlawful Detainer-☐ A6020F Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure 2., 6. Post-Foreclosure (34) Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38) ☐ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs 2., 6.

Samuel Castillo v. Caliber Bodyworks of Texas, Inc.

CASE NUMBER

•	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	<b>B</b> Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
	Asset Forfeiture (05)	☐ A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2., 6.
view	Petition re Arbitration (11)	☐ A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 5.
Judicial Review	Writ of Mandate (02)	□ A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus □ A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter □ A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2., 8. 2. 2.
	Other Judicial Review (39)	☐ A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
ion	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	☐ A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
Litigal	Construction Defect (10)	☐ A6007 Construction Defect	1., 2., 3.
mplex	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	☐ A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
Ily Co	Securities Litigation (28)	□ A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	□ A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
Pro	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	□ A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Enforcement of Judgment	Enforcement of Judgment (20)	<ul> <li>□ A6141 Sister State Judgment</li> <li>□ A6160 Abstract of Judgment</li> <li>□ A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations)</li> <li>□ A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes)</li> <li>□ A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax</li> <li>□ A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case</li> </ul>	2., 9. 2., 6. 2., 9. 2., 8. 2., 8. 2., 8.
ıs nts	RICO (27)	☐ A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
Miscellaneou ©Civil Complair	Other Complaints (Not Specified Above) (42)	<ul> <li>□ A6030 Declaratory Relief Only</li> <li>□ A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment)</li> <li>□ A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)</li> <li>□ A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)</li> </ul>	1., 2., 8. 2., 8. 1., 2., 8. 1., 2., 8.
√. N)	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	☐ A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
Miscellaneous _ T Givil-Petitions T	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above) (43)	<ul> <li>□ A6121 Civil Harassment</li> <li>□ A6123 Workplace Harassment</li> <li>□ A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case</li> <li>□ A6190 Election Contest</li> <li>□ A6110 Petition for Change of Name</li> <li>□ A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law</li> <li>□ A6100 Other Civil Petition</li> </ul>	2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2. 2., 7. 2., 3., 4., 8. 2., 9.
l			, 0.

HORT TITLE: Samuel Castillo	v. Caliber Bodywo	rks of Texas,	Inc. CASE NUMBER
Item III. Statement of Loc circumstance indicated in	ation: Enter the add to Item II., Step 3 o	ress of the acc n Page 1, as t	ident, party's residence or place of business, performance, or oth he proper reason for filing in the court location you selected.
REASON: Check the appropriate boxes for the numbers shown under Column C for the type of action that you have selected for this case.			ADDRESS: 28367 San Canyon Rd., Apt. 6
☑1. □2. □3. □4. [	□5. □6. □7. □8. 〔	□9. □10.	
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP CODE:	
Canyon Country	CA	91387	
and correct and that the a	above-entitled matter istrict of the Superior	is properly file	rjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true d for assignment to the Stanley Mosk courthouse in the hia, County of Los Angeles [Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local

# PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY COMMENCE YOUR NEW COURT CASE:

(SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PARTY)

1. Original Complaint or Petition.

Dated: February 17, 2015

- 2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
- 3. Civil Case Cover Sheet, Judicial Council form CM-010.
- Civil Case Cover Sheet Addendum and Statement of Location form, LACIV 109, LASC Approved 03-04 (Rev. 03/11).
- 5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
- 6. A signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, Judicial Council form CIV-010, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age will be required by Court in order to issue a summons.
- Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copies of the cover sheet and this addendum must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case.

**(3)** 

U1