Edwin Aiwazian (SBN 232943) LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC 410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203 Glendale, California 91203 Tel: (818) 265-1020 / Fax: (818) 265-1021 1 2 DEC 07 2011 3 4 Attorneys for Plaintiff 5 6 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 7 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 8 BC474789 9 JEREMY WISS; individually, and on Case No.: behalf of other members of the general 10 public similarly situated; **CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR** 11 **DAMAGES** Plaintiff, 12 (1) Violation of California Labor Code § 1194 VS. (Unpaid Minimum and Overtime Wages) 13 DOUGLAS EMMETT, INC., a (2) Violation of California Business and Maryland corporation; DOUGLAS EMMETT MANAGEMENT, INC., a 14 Professions Code § 17200, et seq. 15 Delaware corporation; DOUGLAS **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** EMMETT, LLC, an unknown business entity; and DOES 1 through 100, 16 inclusive, 17 Defendants. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 主意/禁禁/注意

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

///

COMES NOW, Plaintiff JEREMY WISS ("Plaintiff"), individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, and alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. This class action is brought pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial. The "amount in controversy" for Plaintiff, including claims for compensatory damages, penalties, interest, and attorneys' fees, is less than seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000).
- 2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the superior court "original jurisdiction in all other causes" except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.
- 3. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and belief, each party is either a citizen of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avails itself of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
- 4. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief,
 Defendant maintains offices, has agents, and/or transacts business in the State of
 California, County of Los Angeles. Furthermore, Plaintiff resides in the State of
 California, County of Los Angeles, and the acts and omissions alleged herein took place
 in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff JEREMY WISS ("Plaintiff") is an individual residing in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

///

- 6. Defendants DOUGLAS EMMETT, INC., DOUGLAS EMMETT MANAGEMENT, INC., and DOUGLAS EMMETT, LLC (hereinafter referred to as "DOUGLAS EMMETT"), at all times herein mentioned, were and are, upon information and belief, a Maryland corporation, a Delaware corporation, and an unknown business entity, respectively, and at all times hereinafter mentioned, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles.
- 7. At all relevant times, DOUGLAS EMMETT was the "employer" of Plaintiff within the meaning of all applicable state laws and statutes.
- 8. At all times herein relevant, DOUGLAS EMMETT and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, were the agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators and assigns, and all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization and consent of each defendant designated herein.
- 9. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual or otherwise, of defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff who sues said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based on that information and belief alleges, that each of the defendants designated as a DOE is legally responsible for the events and happenings referred to in this Complaint, and unlawfully caused the injuries and damages to Plaintiff as alleged in this Complaint. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to show the true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.
- 10. DOUGLAS EMMETT and DOES 1 through 100 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as "Defendants."

///

///

11. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants including the unknown defendants identified as DOES, directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff and the other class members so as to make each of said Defendants employers and employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 12. Plaintiff brings this action on his own behalf and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and, thus, seeks class certification under Code of Civil Procedure section 382.
 - 13. The proposed class is defined as follows:

 All current and former California-based (i.e., currently residing in

 California and current Citizens of the State of California) salaried

 property-level employees, or persons who held similar job titles and/or

 performed similar job duties, who worked for Defendants within the State

 of California at any time during the period from four years preceding the

 filing of this Complaint to final judgment.
 - 14. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish subclasses as appropriate.
- 15. The class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation:
 - a. Numerosity: The class members are so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable. The membership of the entire class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, the class is estimated to be greater than one-hundred (100) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment records.

- b. <u>Typicality</u>: Plaintiff's claims are typical of all other class members' as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the other class members with whom he has a well-defined community of interest.
- c. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of each class member, with whom he has a well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no interest that is antagonistic to the other class members. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and during the pendency of this action will continue to incur, costs and attorneys' fees, that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.
- d. <u>Superiority</u>: A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder of all class members is impractical.
- e. <u>Public Policy Considerations</u>: Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. However, class actions provide the class members who are not named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights.
- 16. There are common questions of law and fact as to the class members that predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The following common questions of law or fact, among others, exist as to the members of the class:

- a. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;
- b. Whether Defendants' California based (i.e., currently residing in California and current Citizens of the State of California) salaried property-level employees, or persons who held similar job titles and/or performed similar job duties, were classified as "exempt" in violation of California law;
- c. Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class members to work over eight (8) hours per day and/or over forty (40) hours per week and failed to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiff and the other class members;
- d. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the other class members of meal periods or required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during meal periods without compensation;
- e. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the other class members of rest periods or required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during rest periods without compensation;
- f. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members;
- g. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members within the required time upon their discharge or resignation;
- h. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members during their employment;
- i. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the California Labor Code; including, *inter alia*, section 226;

- j. Whether Defendants kept complete and accurate payroll records as required by the California Labor Code, including, *inter alia*, section 1174(d);
- k. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs;
- l. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.;
- n. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and
- o. Whether Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 17. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other persons as salaried "exempt" employees.
- 18. Defendants, jointly, employed Plaintiff as a salaried property-level employee from approximately August 2009 to approximately September 2010 in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.
- 19. Defendants hired Plaintiff, misclassified him as an "exempt" employee, and paid him on a salary basis from approximately August 2009 to approximately September 2010, without any compensation for overtime hours worked, missed meal periods or rest breaks.
- 20. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the other class members; to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment; and to supervise their daily employment activities.

///

- 21. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and the other class members.
- 22. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff and the other class members.
- 23. Defendants continue to employ "exempt" or salary paid employees within the State of California.
- 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times herein relevant, Defendants were advised by skilled lawyers and other professionals, employees, advisors, and consultants highly knowledgeable about California wage laws, employment and personnel practices.
- 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times herein relevant, without any justification, Defendants ignored the employment and personnel policy changes proposed by skilled lawyers and other professionals, employees, advisors, and consultants highly knowledgeable about California wage laws, employment and personnel practices.
- 26. Plaintiff and the other class members worked over eight (8) hours in a day, and/or forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.
- 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants engaged in a uniform policy and systematic scheme of wage abuse against their salaried property-level positions. This scheme involved, *inter alia*, misclassifying these positions as "exempt" for purposes of the payment of overtime compensation when, in fact, they were "non-exempt" employees according to California law.
- 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation and that they were not receiving wages for overtime compensation.

29.

Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that

was missed.

31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that

Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, and they did not receive all rest

missed, and they did not receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of

pay at Plaintiff's and the other class member's regular rate of pay when a meal period

periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other class members' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed.

32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were
entitled to receive at least minimum wages for compensation and that they were not
receiving at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were
entitled to receive all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including
overtime and minimum wages and meal and rest period premiums, and they did not, in
fact, receive all such wages owed to them at the time of their discharge.

///

///

///

///

///

- 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive all wages owed to them during their employment. Plaintiff and the other class members did not receive payment of all wages, including overtime and minimum wages and meal and rest period premiums, within any time permissible under California Labor Code section 204.
- 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
 Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were
 entitled to receive complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California
 law, but, in fact, they did not receive complete and accurate wage statements from
 Defendants. The deficiencies included, *inter alia*, the failure to include the total
 number of hours worked by Plaintiff and the other class members.
- 36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Defendants had to keep complete and accurate payroll records for Plaintiff and the other class members in accordance with California law, but, in fact, did not keep complete and accurate payroll records.
- 37. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses and costs.
- 38. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
 Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff
 and the other class members pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had the
 financial ability to pay such compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally
 failed to do so, and falsely represented to Plaintiff and the other class members that they
 were properly denied wages, all in order to increase Defendants' profits.

- 39. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff and the other class members. Plaintiff and the other class members were required to work more than eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week without overtime compensation.
- 40. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide all requisite uninterrupted meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members.
- 41. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members at least minimum wages for all the hours they worked.
- 42. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation.
- 43. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members wages within any time permissible under California law, including, *inter alia*, California Labor Code section 204.
- 44. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants regularly and consistently failed to provide complete and accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and the other class members.
- 45. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants regularly and consistently failed to keep complete and accurate payroll records for Plaintiff and the other class members.
- 46. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants regularly and consistently failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs.
- 47. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants regularly and consistently failed to properly compensate Plaintiff and the other class members pursuant to California law in order to increase Defendants' profits.
- 48. California Labor Code section 218 states that noting in Article 1 of the Labor Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to "sue directly . . . for any wages or penalty due to him [or her] under this article."

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California Labor Code § 1194

(Against ALL DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 100)

- 49. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 48, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.
- 50. At all relevant times, California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 provided that the minimum wage for employees fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.
- 51. California Labor Code section 1194 and 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order further provided that it was unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay time-and-one-half or two-times that person's regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.
- 52. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and were required to pay Plaintiff and the other class members employed by Defendants, and working more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, at a rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.
- 53. California Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-and-one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work, and to overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day of work.
- 54. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members were not paid for all the hours they worked.

- 55. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members were not paid at least minimum wage compensation for all hours worked.
- 56. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members were not paid overtime compensation for the hours they worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day and/or forty (40) hours in a week.
- 57. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members as required, pursuant to California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.
- 58. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to pay all overtime wages owed to Plaintiff and the other class members as required, pursuant to California Labor Code sections 510, 1194 and 1198.
- 59. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the minimum wage as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Pursuant to those sections, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum wage compensation as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees, and liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.
- 60. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the unpaid balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of California Labor Code sections 510, 1194 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.
- 61. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover their unpaid minimum wages and overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.
- 62. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover a penalty of one hundred dollars (\$100) for the initial failure to timely pay each employee minimum wages, and two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each subsequent failure to pay each employee minimum wages.

● 医が**ので**が重要

63. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, et seq. (Against ALL DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 100)

- 64. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 63, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.
- 65. Defendants' conduct, as alleged in this Complaint, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff and the other class members, and Defendants' competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the other class members seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.
- 66. Defendants' activities as alleged herein are violations of California law, and constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.
- 67. A violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq. may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the other class members, to work overtime without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198. Additionally, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the other class members, to work through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Moreover, Defendants' policies and practices of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other class members violate California Labor Code sections 201, 202 and 204.

Defendants also violated California Labor Code sections 226(a), 1174(d), 2800 and 2802.

Failure to Pay Overtime

68. Defendants' failure to pay overtime in violation of the Wage Orders and California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

Failing to Provide Meal Periods

69. Defendants' failure to provide legally required meal periods in violation of the Wage Orders and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a), as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

Failure to Provide Rest Periods

70. Defendants' failure to provide legally required rest periods in violation of the Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

71. Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages in violation of the Wage Orders and California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination

72. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages upon termination in violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and 202, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

///

///

///

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

73. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages during employment in violation of California Labor Code section 204, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

Failure to Provide Compliant Wage Statements

74. Defendants' failure to provide compliant wage statements in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a), as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

Failure to Keep Complete and Accurate Payroll Records

75. Defendants' failure to keep complete and accurate payroll records in violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d), as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business-Related Expenses and Costs

- 76. Defendants' failure to reimburse necessary business-related expenses and costs in violation of California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.
- 77. As a result of the herein described violations of California law, Defendants unlawfully gained an unfair advantage over other businesses.
- 78. Plaintiff and the other class members have been personally injured and continue to be injured by Defendants' unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including, but not necessarily limited to, the loss of money and/or property.

///

///

///

- 79. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq., Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to restitution of the wages and other monies wrongfully withheld and retained by Defendants pursuant to California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.
- 80. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq., Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences from four years preceding the filing of this Complaint; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, requests a trial by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the general public similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

Class Certification

- 1. That this action be certified as a class action;
- 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class;
- 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel; and
- 4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel, immediately upon its appointment, the names and most current contact information (address and telephone numbers) of all class members.

As to the First Cause of Action

- 5. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all minimum and overtime wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members;
- 6. For general unpaid wages, unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;
- 7. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid minimum wages and overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due:
- 8. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1 for Plaintiff and the other class members in the amount as may be established according to proof at trial;
 - 9. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2;
- 10. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194(a);
- 11. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Second Cause of Action

California Business and Professions Code section 17200, et seq. by failing to provide Plaintiff and the other class members all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay for all missed meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay all minimum wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay Plaintiff's and other class members' wages timely as required by California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 204, failing to provide Plaintiff and other class members with complete and accurate wage statements, and failing to keep complete and accurate

payroll records, and failing to reimburse Plaintiff and other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs.

- 13. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
- 14. For restitution of unpaid wages and other monies wrongfully withheld and retained by Defendants to Plaintiff and the other class members and prejudgment interest from the day such amount were due and payable;
- 15. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully withheld acquired by Defendants as a result of violations of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.;
- 16. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein that Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover under California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5; and
- 17. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

DATED: December 6, 2011

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC

Edwin Aiwazian

Attorneys for Plaintiff

	<u>CM-010</u>		
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): Edwin Aiwazain (SBN 232943)	FOR COURT USE ONLY		
LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC			
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203			
Glendale, CA 91203			
TELEPHONE NO.: (818) 265-1020 FAX NO.: (818) 265-1021	SUPERIOR COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff Jeremy Wiss	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS Angeles	חבר מת מחום		
STREET ADDRESS: 111 North Hill Street	DEC 0.7.2011		
MAILING ADDRESS:			
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles 90012	John A. Clarke/Executive Officer/Clerk		
BRANCH NAME: Stanley Mosk Courthouse	By U.S. V. C. Deputy		
CASE NAME:	AMBER LAFLEUR-CLAYTON		
Wiss vs. Douglas Emmett, Inc., et al			
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER:		
Unlimited Limited Counter Joinder	BC474789		
(Amount (Amount)	JUDGE:		
demanded demanded is Filed with first appearance by defendant	DEST		
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less) (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	DEPT:		
Items 1–6 below must be completed (see instructions on pa	198 <i>2).</i>		
1. Check one box below for the case type that best describes this case:	Islandly Complex Chill Litingston		
Cal	Islonally Complex Civil Litigation Rules of Court, rules 3.400–3.403)		
Auto (22)	·		
Uninsured motorist (46) Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)		
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property University Other collections (09)	Construction defect (10)		
Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort Insurance coverage (18)	Mass tort (40)		
Asbestos (04) Uther contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)		
Product liability (24) Real Property	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)		
Medical malpractice (45) Eminent domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	Insurance coverage claims arising from the		
Maranghil origina (22)	above listed provisionally complex case types (41)		
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort Wrongful eviction (33)	rcement of Judgment		
Business torvuntair business practice (07)	<u> </u>		
Civil rights (08) Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)		
	ellaneous Civil Complaint		
Fraud (16) Residential (32)	RICO (27)		
intellectual property (19) Drugs (38)	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)		
Professional negligence (25) Judicial Review Misc	ellaneous Civil Petition		
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35) Asset forfeiture (05)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)		
Employment Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)		
Wrongful termination (36) Writ of mandate (02)			
Other employment (15) Other judicial review (39)			
2. This case is is not complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of	of Court. If the case is complex, mark the		
factors requiring exceptional judicial management:			
a. Large number of separately represented parties d. Large number of v	witnesses		
b. Extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel e. Coordination with	related actions pending in one or more courts		
issues that will be time-consuming to resolve in other counties,	states, or countries, or in a federal court		
c. Substantial amount of documentary evidence f. Substantial postju	dgment judicial supervision		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	aratory or injunctive relief c. 📈 punitive		
4. Number of causes of action (specify): Two (2)			
5. This case ✓ is is not a class action suit.			
6. If there are any known related cases, file and serve a notice of related case. (You may	use form CM-015.)		
Date: December 6, 2011	11.		
Edwin Aiwazian	thorn		
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME) (SIGNA)	TURE OF BARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)		
NOTICE NOTICE	weent ampli alaima agges or agges filed		
 Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first paper filed in the action or proceeding (e under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules o 	f Court, rule 3,220) Failure to file may result		
in sanctions.	a court, rule 5.226.) I allule to lile may result		
File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule.			
If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all			
A sther parties to the action or proceeding			
Unless this is a collections case under rule 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sheet w	vill be used for statistical purposes only.		

SHORT TITLE: Wiss vs. Douglas Emmett, Inc., et al.	CASE NUMBER	RC47478	9

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

This form is re	quired pursuant to Local Rule 2.0 in all new civ	il case filings in the Los Angeles Sເ	perior Court.
•	pes of hearing and fill in the estimated length of	- •	☐ HOURS/ ☑ DAYS
Item II. Indicate the	correct district and courthouse location (4 steps	 If you checked "Limited Case", ski 	ip to Item III, Pg. 4):
case in the left ma	t completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet form, find the control of the column to the right in Column to the Cincol of the Column to the Cincol of the Column to the Column	vil Case Cover Sheet case type you	selected.
•	nn ${f C}$, circle the reason for the court location cho exception to the court location, see Local Rule 2	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	you have
	Applicable Reasons for Choosing Courthous	Location (see Column C below)	
May be filed in cer Location where car	t be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, central district. htral (other county, or no bodily injury/property damage). use of action arose. dily injury, death or damage occurred. rformance required or defendant resides.	6. Location of property or permanently g 7. Location where petitioner resides. 8. Location wherein defendant/responde 9. Location where one or more of the pa 10. Location of Labor Commissioner Office	ent functions wholly.

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

	Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	Type of/Action? (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
요ㄷ	Auto (22)	☐ A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
Auto Tort	Uninsured Motorist (46)	☐ A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death — Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
ਣੇ ਦ	Asbestos (04)	☐ A6070 Asbestos Property Damage ☐ A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2. 2.
Proper ath To	Product Liability (24)	A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
al Injury/ F ongful Dea	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 Tort	Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	 □ A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) □ A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.) □ A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress □ A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death 	1., 4. 1., 4. 1., 3. 1., 4.

SHORT TITLE:			
Wiee ve	Douglas Emmett	Inc	et:

CASE NUMBER

	Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Actions (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
	Business Tort (07)	☐ A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 3.
operty th Tor	Civil Rights (08)	□ A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
ıry/ Pr ıl Dea	Defamation (13)	□ A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
Non-Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort	Fraud (16)	☐ A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.
ersor ge/W	Professional Negligence (25)	☐ A6017 Legal Malpractice	1., 2., 3.
Jon-P	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.
gent	Wrongful Termination (36)	☐ A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.
Employment	Other Employment (15)	☑ A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case) , 2., 3.
Ë	Other Employment (15)	☐ A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	10.
Contract	Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance) Collections (09)	 □ A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) □ A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) □ A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) □ A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence) □ A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff □ A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case 	2., 5. 2., 5. 1., 2., 5. 1., 2., 5. 2., 5., 6. 2., 5.
	Insurance Coverage (18)	A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1., 2., 5., 8.
	Other Contract (37)	□ A6009 Contractual Fraud □ A6031 Tortious Interference □ A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence)	1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 8.
	Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	☐ A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels	2.
perty	Wrongful Eviction (33)	☐ A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2., 6.
Real Property	Other Real Property (26)	 □ A6018 Mortgage Foredosure □ A6032 Quiet Title □ A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foredosure) 	2., 6. 2., 6. 2., 6.
.	Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31)	☐ A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
ıl Detainer	Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32)	☐ A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
=			1

Unlawful Detainer-

Post-Foreclosure (34)

Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)

☐ A6020FUnlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure

☐ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs

2., 6.

2., 6.

SHORT	TITLE.

Wiss vs. Douglas Emmett, Inc., et al.

CASE NUMBER

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet	Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
	Asset Forfeiture (05)	□ A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2., 6.
iew	Petition re Arbitration (11)	□ A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 5.
Judicial Review		□ A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus	2., 8.
Judici	Writ of Mandate (02)	☐ A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter ☐ A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2.
,	Other Judicial Review (39)	☐ A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
<u> </u>	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	☐ A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
itigatic	Construction Defect (10)	☐ A6007 Construction Defect	1., 2., 3.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	□ A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
ly Con	Securities Litigation (28)	□ A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
isional	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	□ A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
Prov	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	☐ A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
		□ A6141 Sister State Judgment	2., 9.
# #	Enforcement of Judgment (20)	☐ A6160 Abstract of Judgment	2., 6.
Enforcement of Judgment		☐ A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations)	2., 9.
or Jud		☐ A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes)	2., 8.
<u> </u>		☐ A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax	2., 8.
		☐ A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 8., 9.
IS Its	RICO (27)	□ A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
cellaneous Complaints		☐ A6030 Declaratory Relief Only	1., 2., 8.
Com	Other Complaints	☐ A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment)	2., 8.
Misc Civil ((Not Specified Above) (42)	☐ A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8.
- 0		☐ A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8.
	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	☐ A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
		☐ A6121 Civil Harassment	2., 3., 9.
Sous		☐ A6123 Workplace Harassment	2., 3., 9.
lane 'etiti	Other Bething	☐ A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case	2., 3., 9.
Miscellaneous Civil Petitions	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above)	☐ A6190 Election Contest	2.
ΞÜ	(43)	☐ A6110 Petition for Change of Name	2., 7.
		☐ A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law	2., 3., 4., 8.
		☐ A6100 Other Civil Petition	2., 9.
		<u> </u>	

Wiss vs. Douglas Emmett, Inc., et al.				CASE NUMBER
				ence or place of business, performance, or other for filing in the court location you selected.
REASON: Check the approunder Column C for the tylthis case.		selected for	ADDRESS: 808 Wilshire Bouleva	ard, Suite 200
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP CODE:	 	
Santa Monica	CA	90401		
and correct and that the	above-entitled matter is District of the Superior Co	properly file	ed for assignment to	of the State of California that the foregoing is true the Stanley Mosk courthouse in the angeles [Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local
Dated: December 6, 20	11		- -	Mai High GNATURE OF ATTORNEY FILLED PARTY)

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

- 1. Original Complaint or Petition.
- 2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
- 3. Civil Case Cover Sheet, Judicial Council form CM-010.
- 4. 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.
- 7. 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.