

1 André E. Jardini (State Bar No. 71335)  
acj@kpclegal.com  
2 KNAPP, PETERSEN & CLARKE  
500 North Brand Boulevard, 20th Floor  
3 Glendale, California 91203-1904  
Telephone: (818) 547-5000  
4 Facsimile: (818) 547-5329

5 Thomas W. Falvey (State Bar No. 65744)  
thomaswfalvey@yahoo.com  
6 J.D. Henderson (State Bar No. 235767)  
jdlaw@charter.net  
7 LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS W. FALVEY  
301 North Lake Avenue, Suite 800  
8 Pasadena, CA 91101  
Telephone: (626) 795-0205  
9 Facsimile: (626) 795-3096

10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
PETER SILVA GUSTAVO GUZMAN, PAUL E.  
11 LASS, JR., JEFF S. MCGILL, THOMAS R. MUNDY  
and STANLEY G. SETTLE, on behalf of themselves  
12 and all others situated

13 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
14 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
15

16 PETER SILVA, GUSTAVO GUZMAN,  
PAUL E. LASS, JR., JEFF S. MCGILL,  
17 THOMAS R. MUNDY and STANLEY G.  
SETTLE, on behalf of themselves and all  
18 others situated,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 GETRONICS USA, INC., GETRONICS  
FLEXIBLE SOLUTIONS, LLC, and DOES 2  
22 through 50, inclusive,

23 Defendants.  
24  
25  
26

) NO. BC 368049

) Dept: 36

) Judge: The Hon. Gregory W. Alarcon  
) Date Action Filed: 3/19/2007

) [PROPOSED] FIRST AMENDED  
) COMPLAINT FOR COMPENSATORY  
) AND EXEMPLARY DAMAGES

) (1) NONPAYMENT OF WAGES -  
) VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE  
) SECTIONS 204, 210, 226.7 and 512

) (2) UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES

) CLASS ACTION [CODE OF CIV.  
) PROC. SECTION 382]

27 ///

28

1 Plaintiffs Peter Silva, Gustavo Guzman, Paul E. Lass, Jr., Jeff S. McGill, Thomas R.  
2 Mundy and Stanley G. Settle on behalf of themselves and all others situated (collectively  
3 "Plaintiff Class") allege as follows:

4 PARTIES

5 1. Plaintiff Peter Silva is a citizen of the State of California and resides in the  
6 County of Los Angeles.

7 2. Plaintiff Gustavo Guzman is a citizen of the State of California and resides in  
8 the County of Los Angeles.

9 3. Plaintiff Paul E. Lass, Jr. was a citizen of the State of California and resided  
10 in the County of Los Angeles while employed by Defendants during the class period.

11 4. Plaintiff Jeff S. McGill is a citizen of the State of California and resides in the  
12 County of Los Angeles.

13 5. Plaintiff Thomas Mundy is a citizen of the State of California and resides in  
14 the County of San Diego.

15 6. Plaintiff Stanley G. Settle is a citizen of the State of California and resides in  
16 the County of Los Angeles.

17 7. Defendant Getronics USA, Inc. was a subsidiary of Getronics, NV, a  
18 Netherlands corporation doing business in the State of California, County of Los Angeles,  
19 during the class period. Getronics NV is an international corporation with 24,000  
20 employees in 25 countries and is a subsidiary of the Dutch telecommunications firm KPN.  
21 Getronics USA, Inc. was acquired on August 20, 2008 and is now a subsidiary of  
22 CompuCom Systems, Inc., a Delaware corporation. Getronics USA, Inc. maintains offices  
23 in the State of California. Getronics Flexible Solutions, LLC (formerly Doe 1) is a  
24 Delaware limited liability company (LLC) that maintains offices in the State of California.  
25 Getronics USA, Inc. and Getronics Flexible Solutions, LLC (henceforth, "defendants") are  
26 defendants. Getronics NV is not a defendant.

27 8. Plaintiffs are unaware of the names and capacities of the defendants sued  
28 herein as DOES 2 through 50, inclusive. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and upon that

1 basis allege, that each of the defendants sued herein as DOES 2 through 50, inclusive, is  
2 responsible in some manner for the wrongs alleged herein and is legally liable to the  
3 plaintiffs. Plaintiffs will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities  
4 when such information is ascertained.

5 9. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and on that basis allege that at all times  
6 relevant herein, each of the defendants was acting as the agent, employee and/or joint  
7 venturer of the remaining defendants and in so doing the things herein described, was  
8 acting within the scope of such agency, employment and/or joint venture except where  
9 designated otherwise.

10 CLASS ALLEGATIONS

11 10. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and all others similarly  
12 situated, as a class action under section 382, Code of Civil Procedure. The class which  
13 plaintiffs seek to represent is composed of and defined as follows: All California  
14 employees of defendants paid on an hourly basis as nonexempt employees for the period of  
15 four years before the filing of this complaint to the present.

16 11. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class  
17 action, under the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure section 382, because there is a well-  
18 defined community of interest in the litigation and the proposed class is easily  
19 ascertainable.

20 12. **Numerosity:** The Plaintiff Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of  
21 all members is impracticable under the circumstances of this case. While the exact number  
22 of class members is presently unknown to plaintiffs, plaintiffs are informed and believe that  
23 during the time period concerned herein, defendants, as a matter of corporate practice,  
24 engaged in violations of law concerning its practices in the payment of employees and that  
25 said wage and hour violations occurred universally throughout the offices of defendants in  
26 California over at least the last four years. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and  
27 thereupon allege that the number of nonexempt employees in the State of California  
28 numbers in the hundreds of individuals.

1           13.    **Common Questions Predominate:** Common questions of law and fact exist  
2 as to all members of the Plaintiff Class and predominate over any questions which affect  
3 only individual members of the class. These common questions of law and fact include,  
4 without limitation:

5           (a)    Whether defendants violated wage and hour laws in establishing a  
6 policy of failing to pay overtime wages for the services of hourly employees.

7           (b)    Whether defendants violated wage and hour laws, in adopting a policy  
8 and practice to fail to ensure that nonexempt employees are provided required meal breaks.

9           (c)    Whether defendants violated wage and hour laws in adopting a policy  
10 and practice of failing to make available required rest breaks.

11          (d)    The amount of wages and/or penalties owed by defendants for willful  
12 failure to pay wages;

13          (e)    The amount of penalties and/or wages owed by defendants for failing  
14 to provide required breaks.

15          (f)    The appropriate nature of class-wide equitable relief in the form of an  
16 injunction to prevent such wage and hour violations in the future.

17           14.    **Typicality:** Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the members of the  
18 Plaintiff Class. Plaintiffs have worked within the class period as hourly nonexempt  
19 employees of defendants and suffered the wage and hour violations complained of here.  
20 Plaintiffs and all members of the Plaintiff Class sustained damages arising out of  
21 defendants' adoption of policies in a common course of conduct in violation of law as  
22 complained of herein. The damages of each member of the Plaintiff Class were caused by  
23 the defendants' wrongful conduct in violation of the wage and hour laws herein alleged.

24           15.    **Adequacy:** Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the  
25 members of the Plaintiff Class. Plaintiffs reside, or resided, in California, and are, or have  
26 been, nonexempt employees of defendants as to whom defendants failed to pay wages  
27 earned.

28 ///

1 16. Plaintiffs have retained counsel who have substantial experience in the  
2 prosecution of wage and hour cases and in the prosecution of complex class action  
3 litigation.

4 17. **Superiority:** A class action is superior to other available means for the fair  
5 and efficient adjudication of this controversy, since the individual joinder of all members of  
6 the class is impracticable. Class action will permit a large number of similarly situated  
7 persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum simultaneously, efficiently, and  
8 without the unnecessary duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions  
9 would engender. Furthermore, as the damage suffered by each individual of the class may  
10 be small, on a relative basis, the expenses and burden of individual litigation would make it  
11 difficult or impossible for individual members of the class to redress the wrongs done to  
12 them. Moreover, an important public benefit will be realized by addressing the matter as a  
13 class action. The cost to the court system of adjudication of such individualized litigation  
14 would be substantial. Individualized litigation would also present the potential for  
15 inconsistent or contradictory judgments.

16 18. Plaintiffs are unaware of any difficulties that are likely to be encountered in  
17 the management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class proceeding.

#### 18 INTRODUCTION

19 19. This action arises out of the prevalent practices engaged in by defendants in  
20 willfully failing to pay overtime wages earned by nonexempt employees and willfully  
21 failing to ensure or provide appropriate meal and rest breaks as required by law.

22 20. Defendants have engaged in at least the following violations with regard to  
23 their employees in the State of California:

24 (a) Defendants violated wage and hour laws in establishing a policy of  
25 failing to pay overtime wages for the services of hourly employees.

26 (b) Defendants violated wage and hour laws, in adopting a policy and  
27 practice to fail to ensure that nonexempt employees are provided required meal breaks.

28 (c) Defendants violated wage and hour laws in adopting a policy and

1 practice of failing to make available required rest breaks.

2 21. The conduct of defendants, which has been abetted and encouraged  
3 throughout defendants' offices in the State of California for many years, has resulted in  
4 unwarranted profits to defendants at the expense of defendants' employees.

5 22. Damages are warranted to repay employees for this egregious and illegal  
6 conduct.

7 23. Injunctive relief is necessary to prevent such conduct in the future.

8 24. Defendants are herewith notified that all employment records concerning  
9 hourly nonexempt employees should be maintained. The time records of employees should  
10 not be destroyed pursuant to any preordained destruction calendar.

11 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

12 (For Nonpayment of Wages Against All Defendants)

13 25. Plaintiffs allege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations of  
14 Paragraphs 1 through 24, inclusive.

15 26. At all times relevant herein Labor Code section 204 required the payment of  
16 all wages earned by the members of the Plaintiff Class.

17 27. At all times relevant herein, Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order No.  
18 4-2001 (8 Cal. Code Reg. § 11040) provides for payment of overtime compensation at not  
19 less than one and half times the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in  
20 excess of eight hours in any workday and for the first eight hours worked on the seventh  
21 consecutive day of work in a work week and double the employee's regular rate of pay for  
22 all hours worked in excess of 12 hours in any workday and for all hours worked in excess  
23 of eight hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in a workweek.

24 28. Members of the Plaintiff Class worked regular time and overtime hours for  
25 defendants which they were not paid.

26 29. Defendants have failed to pay wages earned to members of the Plaintiff Class  
27 pursuant to the policies as herein alleged.

28 30. Defendants' failure to pay the regular and overtime wages of Plaintiff Class

1 members, violates the provisions of Labor Code sections 201 and 1198, and is therefore  
2 unlawful.

3 31. Defendants have failed to ensure that employees take a required meal break  
4 and has not provided required rest breaks, as required by Labor Code section 512.

5 32. Plaintiffs and each member of the Plaintiff Class are entitled to compensation  
6 for one hour of wages for each meal or rest break missed, pursuant to Labor Code section  
7 226.7.

8 33. Civil penalties should be awarded pursuant to Labor Code section 558.

9 34. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194(a) plaintiffs request that the court award  
10 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in this action.

11 35. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 218.6 and 1194(a), plaintiffs request that the  
12 court award interest on all due and unpaid wages, at the legal rates specified by Civil Code  
13 section 3289(b) accruing from the date the wages were due and payable.

14 36. In doing the acts herein described, defendants acted consciously to deprive  
15 employees of compensation which had been earned. These acts were committed with  
16 malice, oppression and fraud, and punitive damages are warranted pursuant to Civil Code  
17 section 3294.

18 SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

19 (Unfair Business Practices Against All Defendants)

20 37. Plaintiffs allege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations of  
21 paragraphs 1 through 37, inclusive.

22 38. Plaintiffs bring this action both in their individual capacity and on behalf of  
23 all nonexempt employees of defendants as to whom defendants failed to pay wages over the  
24 last four years.

25 39. Defendants' establishment of policy and encouragement of managers to fail to  
26 pay wages is immoral, unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous, substantially injurious to  
27 plaintiffs and the Plaintiff Class and has been implemented through the use of economic  
28 force. It is an unfair business practice under Business & Professions Code section 17200 et.

1 seq, for defendants to consciously, deliberately and in bad faith underpay employees by  
2 adopting these practices.

3 40. Specifically, defendants, by a continuing course of conduct of failing and  
4 refusing to pay wages earned by employees, have engaged, and continue to engage in,  
5 conduct which was, and is, "unlawful, unfair and fraudulent," within the meaning of  
6 Business & Professions Code section 17200 et seq.

7 41. Defendants, accordingly, should be ordered to restore to plaintiffs and the  
8 Plaintiff Class those amounts which defendants have wrongfully retained, in violation of  
9 wage and hour law and in violation of their duty to refrain from "unlawful, unfair and  
10 fraudulent" conduct, as proscribed by Business & Professions Code 17200 et seq.

11 42. As a direct and proximate result of these violations, defendants have obtained  
12 the services of the plaintiffs and the Plaintiff Class and have not paid for those services, all  
13 to the profit of defendants and the detriment of plaintiffs and the Plaintiff Class. The profit  
14 so obtained should be disgorged from defendants as ill-gotten gains.

15 43. The acts as herein alleged are continuing. Unless enjoined, defendants will  
16 continue to reap the benefits of the services of nonexempt employees while failing to pay  
17 for those services. Injunctive relief is warranted.

18 44. The wrongful conduct of defendants unless restrained and enjoined by an  
19 order of this court, will cause great and irreparable harm to plaintiffs and the Plaintiff Class  
20 in that defendants will continue to violate the wage and hour law with impunity and  
21 continue to engage in conduct prohibited by Business & Professions Code section 17200 et  
22 seq. Plaintiffs and the Plaintiff Class have no adequate remedy of law for the injuries they  
23 have suffered and that they will continue to suffer in the future, unless defendants'  
24 wrongful conduct is restrained and enjoined and unless defendants are compelled to refrain  
25 from "unfair, unlawful and fraudulent" acts and practices. Plaintiffs and the Plaintiff Class  
26 therefore pray for a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction and permanent  
27 injunction enjoining such conduct.

28 ///



1           WHEREFORE, plaintiffs pray for relief as follows:

2           1.     For a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction and permanent  
3 injunction restraining defendants and their agents and employees from continuing to violate  
4 the wage and hour laws as alleged herein.

5           2.     For a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction and permanent  
6 injunction prohibiting defendants and their agents and employees from continuing to  
7 withhold from plaintiffs and the members of the Plaintiff Class compensation for overtime  
8 hours worked.

9           3.     For a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction and permanent  
10 injunction mandating that defendants and their agents and employees provide to each  
11 nonexempt hourly employee the meal breaks and rest breaks required by law.

12          4.     For a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction and permanent  
13 injunction restraining defendants and their agents and employees from continuing to  
14 commit unlawful, unfair and fraudulent practices in violation of Business & Professions  
15 Code 17200 et seq., including from continuing to commit violations of the wage and hour  
16 laws by use of economic force against plaintiffs and the members of the Plaintiff Class.

17          5.     For restitution to plaintiffs and members of the Plaintiff Class of those  
18 overtime wages which defendants have wrongfully refused to pay, in violation of the wage  
19 and hour law.

20          6.     For compensatory damages in an amount according to proof to plaintiffs and  
21 the members of the Plaintiff Class.

22          7.     For an award of wages pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7 for each missed  
23 meal or rest break.

24          8.     For an award of exemplary damages for the purpose of punishing defendants  
25 and deterring unlawful conduct in the future.

26          9.     For interest on all sums awarded.

27          10.    For reasonable attorneys' fees incurred.

28          11.    For costs of suit.

1 12. For such other and further relief as the court finds proper.  
2

3 Dated: October 29, 2008

KNAPP, PETERSEN & CLARKE and THE LAW  
OFFICES OF THOMAS W. FALVEY

4  
5  
6 By: 

7 J.D. Henderson  
8 Attorneys for Plaintiffs PETER SILVA  
9 GUSTAVO GUZMAN, PAUL E.  
10 LASS, JR., JEFF S. MCGILL,  
11 THOMAS R. MUNDY and STANLEY  
12 G. SETTLE, on behalf of themselves  
13 and all others situated  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28