	Case 5:20-cv-00505 Document 1 F	Filed 03/11/20	Page 1 of 10	Page ID #:1		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Megan A. Richmond (SBN 170753) MEGAN A. RICHMOND, APC 655 W. Broadway, Suite 1700 San Diego, CA 92101 T: (619) 577-4253 F: (619) 577-4250 megan@therichmondfirm.com C. Brooks Cutter (SBN 121407) John R. Parker, Jr. (SBN 257761) Celine E. Cutter (SBN 312622) CUTTER LAW P.C. 401 Watt Ave., Suite 100 Sacramento, CA 95864 T: (916) 290-9400 F: (916) 588-9330 bcutter@cutterlaw.com jparker@cutterlaw.com ccutter@cutterlaw.com					
13 14	Counsel for Plaintiffs					
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
16	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – EASTERN DIVISION					
17 18 19	BRIANA RIBOTA; NICOALE SYLVESTRE; LASHA DALTON; and YOLANDA SALAZAR, individually					
20	and on behalf of all others similarly situated,		TIVE ACTION OMPLAINT I	N [29 U.S.C. § FOR		
21	Plaintiffs,	VIOLATI	ON OF FAIR RDS ACT DE	LABOR		
22		JURY TRI		ΜΑΝΟ ΓΟΚ		
23	VS.					
24	COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, a					
25	legal subdivision of the State of California, and DOES 1-10, inclusive,					
26	Defendants					
27]				

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. Plaintiffs, Employment Service Specialist workers, Eligibility workers and employees of Defendant COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, bring this action, on their own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated, under the United States Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), for remedies arising out of Defendant's non-payment of overtime.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the claims asserted herein pursuant to Article III of the United States Constitution, 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

3. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). Defendant resides in this District for the purposes of the foregoing venue statute and a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth in this Complaint occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. Plaintiff BRIANA RIBOTA is an individual who resides in this District, and is a citizen of the United States and California. Plaintiff RIBOTA was, at some point during the past three years, employed as a non-exempt Employment Service Specialist worker (an "ESS") by Defendant in the Transitional Assistance Department ("TAD") in this District.

5. Plaintiff NICOALE SYLVESTRE is an individual who resides in this District, and is a citizen of the United States and California. Plaintiff SYLVESTRE was, at some point during the last three years, employed as a non-exempt ESS in this District. 6. Plaintiff LASHA DALTON is an individual who resides in this District, and is a citizen of the United States and California. Plaintiff DALTON was, at some point during the last three years, employed as a non-exempt ESS in this District. Plaintiff DALTON was also, at some point during the last three years, employed as a non-exempt Eligibility Worker (an "EW") by Defendant at TAD.

7. Plaintiff YOLANDA SALAZAR is an individual who resides in this District, and is a citizen of the United States and California. Plaintiff SALAZAR was, at some point during the last three years, employed as a non-exempt ESS in this District.

8. The additional persons who have or may become parties plaintiffs to this collective action are also non-exempt ESS and EW workers who are or were employed by Defendant COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO and who worked overtime hours for said Defendant during the limitations period without receiving any or all of the compensation to which they are entitled.

9. Defendant COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO (hereinafter "Defendant") is a legal subdivision of the State of California, pursuant to Article 11, Section 1(a) of the California Constitution and Ca. Gov. Code § 23002.

10.Defendants DOES 1-10, inclusive, are sued herein under fictitious names. Their true names and capacities are unknown to Plaintiffs. When their true names and capacities are ascertained, Plaintiffs will amend this Complaint by inserting their true names and capacities herein. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that each of these fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences alleged herein and that the damages alleged herein were caused by such defendants.

25 26

//

//

27

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

11. Plaintiffs make the allegations contained herein individually and as representatives of all those similarly situated, on behalf of the below-defined Classes:

a. ESS Class: Every ESS employee of San Bernardino County TAD.

b. EW Class: Every EW employee of San Bernardino County TAD. 12. The allegations contained herein are made upon personal knowledge as to Plaintiffs and their own acts and circumstances, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief.

13. During the applicable limitations period, Plaintiffs were employed as non-exempt workers by Defendant in the TRANSITIONAL ASSISTANCE DEPARTMENT of Defendant's DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES ("TAD Workers").

14. The allegations of this Complaint are applicable to all TAD Workers employed by Defendant during the limitations period, including both current and former employees of Defendant. The allegations of this Complaint are applicable to all of Defendant's offices at which TAD Workers were employed during the limitations period.

15. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and on behalf of all other TAD Workers who were employed by Defendant within the applicable limitations period and who worked in excess of the maximum hours prescribed by 29 U.S.C. § 207(a) without payment of all of the overtime compensation required thereunder. If discovery so indicates, Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend this Complaint to assert a collective action on behalf of one or more sub-classes of workers employed by Defendant's TRANSITIONAL ASSISTANCE DEPARTMENT.

16. Plaintiffs' position and situation is in all respects similar to, if not

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- 4-

identical to, the other persons on whose behalf Plaintiffs bring this action.Plaintiffs reserve the right to seek to certify this action as a collective action with one or more sub-classes.

17. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendant was an enterprise
engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for commerce as
defined by 29 U.S.C. §§ 203(r) and 203(s). At all times relevant to this
Complaint, Defendant was an employer within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 203(d)
and has employed and continued to employ social workers, including Plaintiffs,
within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 203(g).

18. During the applicable limitations period, Plaintiffs were employed byDefendant as TAD Workers.

19. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 207(a), the TAD Workers employed by Defendant, including Plaintiffs, are entitled to be compensated for all of the hours they work for Defendant, as well as time and one-half $(1\frac{1}{2})$ of their regular pay rate for each hour worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week.

20. During the applicable limitations period, Defendant frequently required, suffered, and/or permitted TAD Workers, including Plaintiffs, to work more than forty (40) hours per week without paying them all of the overtime compensation required by 29 U.S.C. § 207(a).

21. Defendant's unlawful conduct has been repeated and consistent throughout the limitations period and during Plaintiffs' employment as TAD Workers.

22. Defendant was aware that TAD Workers, including Plaintiffs, performed and completed work that could not have been completed in forty (40) hours per week and, therefore, required them to work overtime.

23. The job requirements and workloads of TAD Workers, includingPlaintiffs, imposed upon them by Defendant could not be completed in a forty (40)

hour workweek, and Defendant was aware of this fact. Yet, Defendant accepted the benefit of the work without paying TAD Workers overtime.

24. Defendant discouraged and prevented TAD Workers, including Plaintiffs,
from reporting overtime that had not previously been approved and/or authorized.
25. Defendant's practice of requiring TAD Workers, including Plaintiffs, to
complete more work than could be completed in a forty (40) hour workweek
hampered the ability of TAD Workers, including Plaintiffs, to administer
employment and welfare benefits in compliance with state and federal mandates
and regulations.

26. Upon information and belief, Defendant was aware that TAD Workers were working uncompensated overtime so that the TAD Workers could fulfill Defendant's obligation to provide employment and welfare benefits in compliance with state and federal mandates and regulations.

27. During the applicable limitations period, Defendant failed to accurately record, report, and/or preserve records of hours worked by TAD Workers, because Defendant instructed TAD Workers not to enter overtime in their timesheets unless it was pre-approved overtime. On information and belief, TAD Workers logged into a computer system every workday to perform their jobs and to which Defendant had access and of which Defendant had knowledge. On information and belief, the computer system that TAD workers logged into daily demonstrates that TAD Workers, including Plaintiffs, were frequently working outside of regular hours and accruing unpaid overtime. To the extent such records exist, they are in the possession of Defendant and discoverable in this action.

28. Plaintiff RIBOTA consents to be a party plaintiff in this collective action.The written consent of Plaintiff RIBOTA is attached to the Complaint asAttachment A and is incorporated herein by this reference.

COLLECTIVE ACTION COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT - 6-

1

29. Plaintiff SYLVESTRE consents to be a party plaintiff in this collective action. The written consent of Plaintiff SYLVESTRE is attached to the Complaint as Attachment B and is incorporated herein by this reference.

30. Plaintiff DALTON consents to be a party plaintiff in this collective action.The written consent of Plaintiff DALTON is attached to the Complaint asAttachment C and is incorporated herein by this reference.

31. Plaintiff SALAZAR consents to be a party plaintiff in this collective action. The written consent of Plaintiff SALAZAR is attached to the Complaint as Attachment D and is incorporated herein by this reference.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Fair Labor Standards Act)

32. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 27 of this Complaint as though fully set forth in this First Claim for Relief. 33. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendant was an enterprise engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for commerce as defined by 29 U.S.C. §§ 203(r) and 203(s). At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendant was an employer within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 203(d) and has employed and continued to employ social workers, including Plaintiffs, within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 203(g).

34. During the applicable limitations period, Plaintiffs were employed by Defendant as TAD Workers.

35. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 207(a), the TAD Workers employed by Defendant, including Plaintiffs, are entitled to be compensated for all of the hours they work for Defendant, as well as time and one-half (1½) of their regular pay rate for each hour worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week.

36. During the applicable limitations period, Defendant frequently required, suffered, and/or permitted TAD Workers, including Plaintiffs, to work more than

forty (40) hours per week without paying them all of the overtime compensation
 required by 29 U.S.C. § 207(a).

37. Defendant required, suffered, and/or permitted Plaintiff RIBOTA to work more than forty (40) hours per week without paying all of the overtime compensation required by 29 U.S.C. § 207(a) on numerous occasions throughout the applicable limitations period, including, without limitation and upon information and belief.

38. Defendant required, suffered, and/or permitted Plaintiff SYLVESTRE to work more than forty (40) hours per week without paying all of the overtime compensation required by 29 U.S.C. § 207(a) on numerous occasions throughout the applicable limitations period, including, without limitation and upon information and belief.

39. Defendant required, suffered, and/or permitted Plaintiff DALTON to work more than forty (40) hours per week without paying all of the overtime compensation required by 29 U.S.C. § 207(a) on numerous occasions throughout the applicable limitations period, including, without limitation and upon information and belief.

40. Defendant required, suffered, and/or permitted Plaintiff SALAZAR to work more than forty (40) hours per week without paying all of the overtime compensation required by 29 U.S.C. § 207(a) on numerous occasions throughout the applicable limitations period, including, without limitation and upon information and belief.

41. During the applicable limitations period, Defendant failed to accurately
record, report, and/or preserve records of hours worked by TAD Workers,
including Plaintiffs. To the extent such records exist, they are in the possession of
Defendant and discoverable in this action.

42. Upon information and belief, Defendant's failure to pay overtime to TAD
Workers, including Plaintiffs, was "willful" for the purposes of 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).
43. By reason of Defendant's foregoing conduct, TAD Workers, including
Plaintiffs, have suffered harm and been damaged.

44. Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated are entitled to damages in the amount of all unpaid overtime from three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of this action, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 255(a). They are also entitled to liquidated damages, plus interest and costs as allowed by law, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and such other legal and equitable relief as the Court deems just and proper. They are also entitled to recover attorney fees and costs, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Plaintiffs hereby seek all of the foregoing remedies for themselves and all others similarly situated.

45. WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, on their own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated, request relief as set forth in this First Claim for Relief and below.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for the following, on their own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated:

A. Judgment against Defendant for an amount equal to the overtime Defendant failed to pay at the applicable overtime rate, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

B. Liquidated damages in an additional amount equal to the overtime
 Defendant failed to pay at the applicable overtime rate, pursuant to 29
 U.S.C. § 216(b).

C. Attorney fees and costs, pursuant to, inter alia, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

D. A finding that Defendant's violations of law were willful and providing for a recovery period of three (3) years prior to the filing of this Complaint, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

COLLECTIVE ACTION COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT - 9-

E. An award of prejudgment interest.	E. 7	An award	of prejud	dgment interest.
--------------------------------------	------	----------	-----------	------------------

- F. Leave to add additional plaintiffs by motion, the filing of written consent forms, or any other method approved by the Court; and
- G. Such further relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

Dated: March 11, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

	/s/ John R. Parker, Jr.
)	C. Brooks Cutter (SBN 121407)
	John R. Parker, Jr. (SBN 257761)
	Celine E. Cutter (SBN 312622)
2	CUTTER LAW P.C.
3	401 Watt Ave., Suite 100
	Sacramento, CA 95864
ł	T: (916) 290-9400 F: (916) 588-9330
5	bcutter@cutterlaw.com
-	jparker@cutterlaw.com
)	ccutter@cutterlaw.com
7	
,	Megan A. Richmond (SBN 170753)
)	MEGAN A. RICHMOND, APC
)	655 W. Broadway, Suite 1700
,	San Diego, CA 92101
,	T: (619) 577-4253 F: (619) 577-4250
L	megan@therichmondfirm.com
,	
-	
3	
1	
_	
)	
5	
-	
′	
	COLLECTIVE ACTION COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT
	- 10-