LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC 1 SAMUEL WONG, State Bar No. 217104 CHRISTINA K. DALLEN, State Bar No. 247505 2 9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100 Irvine, California 92618 3 Telephone: (949) 379-6250 Facsimile: (949) 379-6251 4 Attorneys for Plaintiff, 5 PETRA ALBERT

OCT 18 2013

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES - CENTRAL DISTRICT

PETRA ALBERT, an individual,

Plaintiff,

VS.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS, a California corporation; SOUTHERN CALIFORNIÀ PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC., a California corporation; KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1 through 20 inclusive.

Desendants.

CASE NO.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES Abrahamkhan

- 1. Disability Discrimination;
 - 2. Failure to Engage in Interactive Process;
 - 3. Failure to Accommodate Disability;
 - 4. Retaliation;
 - Failure to Prevent Discrimination or Retaliation
 - Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy;
 - 7. Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
 - 8. Failure to Provide Rest Periods;
 - 9. Waiting Time Penalties; and

10. Failure to Provide Accurate Wage-ECEIPT # CHELL CHELL CARLES CARLES

JURY TRIAL REQUESTED.

3:5

EA/DEF#:

310)

28

-1-

COMPLAINT

C

Œ \odot

C

(i)

 \mathbb{C}

(J.)

Plaintiff PETRA ALBERT ("Plaintiff") hereby brings this Complaint against Defendants KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC., KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC. (collectively, "Kaiser"), and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, (collectively referred to herein as "Defendants") and alleges as follows:

PARTIES, VENUE, AND GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 1. Plaintiff is, and at all relevant times herein has been, an individual residing in California.
- 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes that KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS is a California corporation with a principal place of business located at One Kaiser Plaza, Oakland, California, in Alameda County California.
- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes that SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC. is a California corporation with a principal place of business located at 393 East Walnut, Pasadena, California in Los Angeles County, California. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC. does or has done business as SoCal Permanente Medical Group during the period relevant to this Complaint.
- 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes that KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC. is a California corporation with a principal place of business located at One Kaiser Plaza, Oakland, California in Alameda County, California.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC., KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC., and the DOE defendants acted in concert, and/or as alter egos of each other, or otherwise are jointly liable for the unlawful conduct complained of herein.
- 6. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants employed in excess of five (5) employees and were/are employers covered by the Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA"), and the California Government Code ("Government Code").

- 7. The true names and capacities, whether a corporation, agent, individual, or otherwise, of defendant DOES 1 through 20, are unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each defendant designated herein as a DOE is negligently or otherwise legally responsible in some manner for the events and happenings referred to herein and thereby proximately caused injuries and damages to Plaintiff as alleged herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint to show their names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.
- 8. At all times mentioned herein, DOES 1 through 20, were the agents, representatives, successors and/or assigns of Kaiser and at all times pertinent hereto were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, representatives, employees, successors and/or assigns.
- 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all times material hereto, Defendants and their agents, employees, alter egos, and/or joint ventures were acting within the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity.
- and DOES 1 through 20 are and were corporations, business entities, individuals and partnerships, licensed to do business and actually doing business in the State of California. Defendants operate medical and hospital facilities in California, including in Orange and Los Angeles counties. As such, and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants are subject to the FEHA, and the Government Code.
- 11. Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 395.5, venue is proper in the above-entitled Court because Defendant SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP's principal place of business is located in Los Angeles County.
- 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants, and each of them, committed other wrongful acts or omissions of which Plaintiff is presently unaware. Plaintiff shall conduct discovery to identify said wrongful acts, and will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint to add said acts upon discovery.

7

12

15 16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23

FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

- Plaintiff Petra Albert began her career as a nurse over 25 years ago. After decades 13. of a successful career, Ms. Albert began working for Kaiser on or about June 1, 2009 as a nurse educator, using her experience to teach and supervise nurses on first-aid, CPR, and other competencies. Within just over a year, Ms. Albert's success at Kaiser was rewarded with a promotion to Assistant Department Administrator ("ADA") and a notable raise.
- In or about 2009, Ms. Albert was diagnosed with breast cancer. Ms. Albert 14. notified Kaiser of her cancer when it became clear that the cancer was not responding to initial treatment and had progressed to the point that required significant intervention, in about September 2010. Ms. Albert then notified Kaiser of her need for medical leave to undergo a double mastectomy and reconstructive surgery in early October 2010.
- By the end of October 2010, Ms. Albert was ready to return to work. When she 15. returned, she received no communication from Kaiser regarding her condition or any need for Instead, Ms. Albert received callous comments and attitudes from her accommodation. supervisors, including comments belittling her serious cancer as "that thing in [her] breast."
- Ms. Albert was forced to immediately return to a 60-hour work week the very 16. same month of her surgery and from the beginning received unprecedented criticism of her performance, micromanaging, and hostility.
- 17. Albert did not give in to the apparent attempt to compel her to resign and kept working for the next three months until her cancer resurfaced and was discovered in her bones in February 2011. After a medical leave for further treatment and chemotherapy, Ms. Albert returned to work in mid-August 2011.
- Upon her return, Ms. Albert was forcibly transferred out of her prestigious position 18. at her local hospital to an undesirable location in a floater position. Ms. Albert's new supervisor made no secret of her desire for Ms. Albert to quit, going so far as threaten that Ms. Albert would hate her life if she continued to work for Kaiser.
- Kaiser also failed to accommodate Ms. Albert's continued need for weekly 19. chemotherapy. Kaiser required Ms. Albert to skip meal and rest periods and work extended hours

on the days she received chemotherapy to "make up" for the time, but that was not enough: Ms. Albert's supervisor also demanded that Ms. Albert come in early two other days a week on top of the extended hours to supposedly also "make up for" the chemotherapy day.

- 20. In an additional example of Kaiser's failure to accommodate or engage with Ms. Albert, Kaiser endangered Ms. Albert's health. Before her return, Ms. Albert's doctors warned her that chemotherapy could seriously weaken her immune system and exposure to infections such as the flu could be disastrous or even fatal. Kaiser, however, did not attempt to accommodate Ms. Albert but rather put her in charge of the flu program, putting her health in serious risk.
- 21. After Ms. Albert's white blood cell count dropped precipitously in October 2011, Ms. Albert's doctors advised her that she could die if she continued to work for Kaiser and be exposed to infected patients. Her doctors therefore placed her on another leave of absence. During the next year, Ms. Albert underwent numerous rounds of chemotherapy and surgeries to attempt to eradicate her cancer.
- 22. When Ms. Albert was ready to return to work, Kaiser again made no efforts to engage with her. Instead, a short time later Kaiser called her into a meeting on her day off to "discuss" her new job assignment and duties. The meeting's insulting intent became clear when the Kaiser personnel repeatedly rolled their eyes at Ms. Albert, ridiculed the dress and shoes she was wearing on her day off, and outrageously threatened Ms. Albert with termination if she did not "improve" her dress despite the fact that the dress was entirely professional, medium sleeved, and not skin-baring or otherwise inappropriate.
- 23. Ms. Albert withstood these intentional insults and refused to give in to the pressure to resign. Kaiser therefore took it one step further and again forcibly transferred and banished her to Kaiser's Santa Ana location.
- 24. After the meeting, Ms. Albert once again sought accommodation and requested a couple hours off once a week, to continue her chemotherapy, offering to make up the time during the week. Kaiser responded by refusing the request and terminating Ms. Albert's employment.
 - 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' termination of her employment

(:

N

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

was due to her disability, request for accommodation, and exercise of her right to take medical leave.

26. Plaintiff timely filed a Charge of Discrimination with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing against Defendants. On or about October 17, 2013, Plaintiff obtained Right-to-Sue Notices authorizing her to institute this action.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Disability Discrimination

- Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations in the paragraphs above 27. as though fully set forth herein.
- At all times relevant herein, Government Code 3 12940(a) was in full force and 28. effect, and was binding upon Defendants. Said section makes it unlawful for an employer to discriminate against an employee on the basis of the employee's disability.
- As more fully set forth above, Plaintiff was disabled while employed by 29. Defendants. Plaintiff's disabilities limited her ability to perform major life activities, including but not limited to her ability to work. Defendants knew and/or treated Plaintiff as if she had a disability that limited her ability to perform major life activities as set forth in this Complaint.
- Plaintiff was willing and able to perform the essential job duties of her position if 30. such reasonable accommodation had been made by Defendants. At no time would the performance of the functions of the employment position, with a reasonable accommodation for Plaintiff's disability, have been a danger to Plaintiff's or any other person's health or safety, nor would it have created an undue hardship to the operation of Defendants' business.
- As set forth more fully above, Defendants discriminated against and took several 31. adverse employment actions against Plaintiff due to her actual or perceived disability including but not limited to failing to accommodate her disability, failing to timely interact in good faith regarding accommodations for her disability, demoting and unfavorably transferring Plaintiff, and ultimately terminating her employment.
- As set forth more fully above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff due to 32. her disability. Defendants refused to accommodate Plaintiff's request for accommodation and

Œ

Ű.

.

C

refused to engage Plaintiff in an interactive process to determine effective reasonable accommodations. Instead, Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment.

- 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes that her actual or perceived disability was a motivating factor in Defendants' decision to terminate Plaintiff's employment.
- 34. As a proximate result of the wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to sustain substantial losses in earnings and other employment benefits in an amount to be determined at trial according to proof.
- 35. As a proximate result of the wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered humiliation, emotional distress, and mental pain and anguish, all to her damage in an amount to be determined at trial according to proof.
- 36. In doing the acts herein alleged, Defendants, and each of them, acted with oppression, fraud, and malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights and Plaintiff is therefore entitled to punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial according to proof.
- 37. Plaintiff has also incurred and continues to incur attorney's fees and legal expenses in an amount to be determined at trial according to proof.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Engage in an Interactive Process

- 38. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations in the paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- At all times relevant herein, Government Code § 12940(n) was in full force and effect, and was binding upon Defendants. Said section provides that it is unlawful for an employer to fail to engage in a timely, good faith, interactive process with an employee to determine effective reasonable accommodations in response to a request by the employee for reasonable accommodation by the employer for a known disability.
- 40. As more fully set forth above, Plaintiff was disabled while employed by Defendants. Plaintiff's disability limited her ability to perform major life activities, including but not limited to her ability to work. Defendants knew and/or treated Plaintiff as if she had a disability that limited her ability to perform major life activities as set forth in this Complaint.

C

 $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}$

(J)

- 41. Plaintiff requested that Defendants make reasonable accommodation(s) for her disability.
- 42. At all times material to this Complaint, Plaintiff was willing to participate in an interactive process to determine whether reasonable accommodation could be made.
- 43. Defendants failed to participate in a timely good-faith interactive process with Plaintiff to determine whether reasonable accommodation could be made. Instead, Defendants terminated her employment.
- 44. As a proximate result of the wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to sustain substantial losses in earnings and other employment benefits in an amount according to proof at the time of trial
- 45. As a proximate result of the wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered humiliation, emotional distress, and mental pain and anguish, all to her damage in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 46. In doing the acts herein alleged, Defendants, and each of them, acted with oppression, fraud, malice, and in conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff, and Plaintiff is therefore entitled to punitive damages according to proof at the time of trial.
- 47. Plaintiff has also incurred and continues to incur attorney's fees and legal expenses in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Accommodate Disability

- 48. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations in the paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 49. At all times relevant herein, Government Code § 12940(m) was in full force and effect, and was binding upon Defendants. Said section provides that it is unlawful for an employer to fail to make reasonable accommodations for the known disability of an employee.
- 50. As more fully set forth above, Plaintiff was disabled while employed by Defendants. Plaintiff's disability limited her ability to perform major life activities, including but not limited to her ability to work. Defendants knew and/or treated Plaintiff as if she had a

disability that limited her ability to perform major life activities as set forth in this Complaint.

- 51. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff was willing and able to perform the essential job duties of her position if a reasonable accommodation had been made by Defendants. At no time would the performance of the functions of the employment position, with a reasonable accommodation for Plaintiff's disability, have been a danger to Plaintiff's or any other person's health or safety, nor would it have created an undue hardship to the operation of Defendants' business.
- 52. As set forth more fully above, Defendants failed to reasonably accommodate her disability. Instead, Defendants summarily terminated her employment.
- 53. As a proximate result of the wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to sustain substantial losses in earnings and other employment benefits in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 54. As a proximate result of the wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered humiliation, entotional distress, and mental pain and anguish, all to his damage in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 55. In doing the acts herein alleged, Defendants, and each of them, acted with oppression, fraud, malice, and in conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff, and Plaintiff is therefore entitled a punitive damages according to proof at the time of trial.
- 56. Plaintiff has also incurred and continues to incur attorney's fees and legal expenses in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Retaliation

- 57. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations in the paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 58. At all times herein mentioned, Government Code § 12940(h) was in full force and effect, and was binding upon Defendants. Said section requires the Defendants to refrain from retaliating against any employee for opposing unlawful employment practices prohibited by the FEHA or for exercising the right to take medical leave pursuant to the CFRA.

<u>ښ</u>

 \odot

Ű.

N._

....

 $\bigcup_{i} \hat{U}_i$

- 59. As set forth fully above, Plaintiff was disabled during her employment with Defendants and engaged in protected activity including but not limited to seeking reasonable accommodations for her disability and attempting to engage in a timely good-faith interactive process.
- 60. As a result of Plaintiff's disability and exercise of her right to seek reasonable accommodation for her disability, Defendants retaliated against Plaintiff by subjecting her to adverse employment actions, including terminating Plaintiff's employment.
- 61. As a proximate result of the wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to sustain substantial losses in earnings and other employment benefits in an amount according to proof at the time of trial
- 62. As a proximate result of the wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered humiliation, emotional distress, and mental pain and anguish, all to his damage in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 63. In doing the acts herein alleged, Defendants, and each of them, acted with oppression, fraud, malice, and in conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff, and Plaintiff is therefore entitled to punitive damages according to proof at the time of trial.
- 64. Plaintiff has also incurred and continues to incur attorney's fees and legal expenses in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Prevent Discrimination, Harassment, or Retaliation

- 65. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations in the paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 66. Plaintiff was subjected to discrimination and retaliation because she suffered from an actual or perceived disability and/or was subjected to retaliation because she sought reasonable accommodation(s), and attempted to engage in a timely good-faith interactive process to determine whether reasonable accommodation was possible.
- 67. Defendants failed to take reasonable steps to prevent the harassment, discrimination, and/or retaliation. Such conduct is in violation of California Government Code

section 12900 et seq. and has resulted in damage and injury to Plaintiff as alleged herein.

- 68. As a proximate result of the wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them,

 Plaintiff has suffered and continues to sustain substantial losses in earnings and other employment
 benefits in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 69. As a proximate result of the wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered humiliation, emotional distress, and mental pain and anguish, all to her damage in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 70. In doing the acts herein alleged, Defendants, and each of them, acted with oppression, fraud, malice, and in conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff, and Plaintiff is therefore entitled to punitive damages according to proof at the time of trial.
- 71. Plaintiff has also incurred and continues to incur attorney's fees and legal expenses in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy

- 72. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations in the paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 73. The discharge of Plaintiff by Defendants violates fundamental principles of public policy in that there is a substantial and fundamental policy against terminating employees for unlawful purposes, including on account of an employee's disability, on account of an employee's request for reasonable accommodations for a disability, on account of an employee's opposition to unlawful practices under the FEHA, and for exercising rights under the Constitution and laws of the State of California.
- 74. On or about June 4, 2013, Defendants wrongfully terminated Plaintiff's employment. Plaintiff is informed and believes that her employment was terminated because of her disability, her request for reasonable accommodations for her disability, her opposition to Defendants' unlawful employment practices, and her exercise of her right to take medical leave.
- 75. In doing the acts described herein, Defendants deprived Plaintiff of prospective career and employment opportunities, as well as other benefits, by failing to perform its duties to

administer and apply all State and local laws, procedures and regulations.

- 76. As a proximate result of Defendants' willful, despicable, and intentional conduct towards Plaintiff, she has sustained substantial losses in earnings and other employment benefits.
- 77. As a proximate result of Defendants' willful, despicable, and intentional conduct towards Plaintiff, she has suffered and continues to suffer humiliation, and emotional distress; the amount of such damages to be determined by proof at trial.
- 78. In light of Defendants' willful, knowing, malicious, and discriminatory conduct towards Plaintiff, Plaintiff seeks an award of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount to be determined at trial according to proof.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

- 79. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations in the paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 80. Labor Code § 512(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders prohibit employers from employing any person for a work period of more than five hours without a meal period of not less than thirty uninterrupted minutes. Further, employers may not employ an employee for a work period of more than ten hours per day without a second meal period of not less than thirty minutes.
- 81. Defendants regularly required Plaintiff to work for more than five and/or ten hours without authorizing or permitting timely, uninterrupted, thirty-minute meal periods. Thus, Defendants have willfully, unfairly, fraudulently or unlawfully failed to authorize or permit Plaintiff to take lawful, timely meal periods pursuant to Labor Code § 512(a).
- 82. As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for premium compensation of one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each meal period that was not authorized or permitted pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, in a total amount to be proven at trial according to proof.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Provide Rest Periods

- 83. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations in the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 84. California law and applicable IWC Wage Orders require employers to authorize and permit all employees to take uninterrupted rest periods. The rest period time is based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten minutes net rest time per four hours or major fraction thereof.
- 85. Plaintiff routinely worked for Defendants shifts in excess of eight hours, but was not authorized or permitted to take rest periods. Defendants have willfully, unfairly, fraudulently or unlawfully failed to authorize or permit Plaintiff to take rest periods pursuant to California law.
- 86. As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for premium compensation of one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that the rest period(s) was not authorized or permitted pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, in a total amount to be determined at trial according to proof.

MINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Waiting Time Penalties

- 87. Plaintin hereby incorporates by reference the allegations in the paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- Labor Code § 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay compensation promptly upon discharge as required pursuant to Labor Code § 201, the employer is liable to the employee for penalties.
- 89. At the time of Plaintiff's termination of employment, Plaintiff had unpaid wages and premium pay for late meal periods.
- 90. Defendants have willfully, unfairly, fraudulently, or unlawfully failed to pay Plaintiff compensation owed upon termination of employment pursuant to Labor Code § 201. Plaintiff's employment with Defendants terminated on or about August 8, 2011, but Defendants

failed to pay Plaintiff all of the unpaid wages and compensation due at the time of termination. As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203 in an amount to be determined at trial, according to proof.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements

- 91. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations in the paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 92. Labor Code § 226(a) requires employers, at the time of each payment of wages, to furnish each employee with an accurate statement itemizing, among other things: (1) gross wages earned; (2) the total hours worked by the employee; (3) all accurations; (4) net wages earned; (5) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; (6) the name of the employee and his or her social security number (last four digits), (7) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and (8) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. California Labor Code § 1174 further requires that such payroll records be kept in a central location.
- 93. Labor Code \$226(e) further provides that if an employer knowingly and intentionally fails to provide a statement itemizing, among other things, the total hours worked by the employee, then the employee is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial violation and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each subsequent violation, up to four thousand dollars (\$4,000).
- Furthermore, the applicable IWC Wage Orders require Defendants to maintain time records showing, among other things, when the employee begins and ends each work period, meal periods, split shift intervals and total daily hours worked in itemized wage statements, and must show all deductions and reimbursements from payment of wages, and accurately report total hours worked by Plaintiff.
- 95. As alleged herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff all compensation earned, including premium compensation for late meal periods as required by the Labor Code. Thus, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with the Labor Code on each and

COMPLAINT

Œ.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL Plaintiff hereby demands trial of Plaintiff's claims by jury to the extent authorized by law. Dated: October 17, 2013 AEGIS LAW, FIRM, Christina K Dallen Attorneys for Plaintiff RETRA ALBERT

Ű.

-16-

Samuel Wong

	,	CM-010
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, Standar	number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY
Samuel Wong (SBN: 217104); Christi	ina K. Dallen (SBN: 24/303)	
Aegis Law Firm, P.C.		
9811 Irvine Center Drive Suite 100, Ir		FILED LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT
TELEPHONE NO.: (949)379-6250	FAX NO.: (949)379-6251	LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff Petra Albert	_ A 1 -	┥ !
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF I O	s Angeles	OCT 18 2013
STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street MAILING ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street		001 2 2013
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, 90012		JOHN A CLARK-CLERK
BRANCH NAME: Central District - Stan	lev Mack	William Marcha.
CASE NAME:	icy wook	87 RRISTINA VARGAS, DEPUTY
Albert v. Kaiser Permanente		
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	O	CASE N BBER: 5 2 5 1 5 5
■ Unlimited ■ Limited	Complex Case Designation	Beanaraa
(Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder	(Q)A
demanded demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defendar	ut JUDGE:
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)		DEPT: 🔷
Items 1–6 be	low must be completed (see instructions on	page 2).
1. Check one box below for the case type that	at best describes this case:	
Auto Tort	Contract Pro	ovisionally Complex Civil Litigation
Auto (22)	Breach of contract/warranty (06) (C	al. 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 types (41)
Noπ-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	
Business tort/unfair business practice (0	7)	Iforcement of Judgment
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31) Mi	scellaneous Civil Complaint
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	RICO (27)
Intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38)	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)
Professional negligence (25)	Judicial Review Mi	scellaneous 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 X is not cor	notex under rule 3.400 of the California Rule	s of Court. If the case is complex, mark the
factors requiring exceptional judicial man		
a. Large number of separately repr	resented parties 💎 d. 🔙 Large number o	of witnesses
b. Extensive motion practice raising		ith related actions pending in one or more courts
issues that will be time-consumi		s, states, or countries, or in a federal court
c. Substantial amount of document	tary evidence f. Substantial pos	tjudgment judicial supervision
C. Demodies associated basels of the description	a X monetary b. nonmonetary: de	claratory or injunctive relief c. X punitive
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply):		Claratory of injunctive relief 0. [_74paritive
4. Number of causes of action (specify): 10		
5. This case is is not a cl		CAA GAE \
6. If there are any known related cases, file	and serve a notice of related case. (You may	ay use with CM2913.)
Date October 17, 2013	. / //	
Christina K. Dallen		
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		NATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)
• Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first paper filed in the action or proceeding (except small claims cases or cases filed		
under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result		
un sanctions.		
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 lighter parties to the action or proceeding.		
• Unless this is a collections case under the	ule 3.740 or a complex case, this cover shee	t will be used for statistical purposes only.
- Offices the is a conections case under to		tage to ta
Form Adopted for Mandalory Use Judicial Council of California	CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.39, 3.220, 3.400–3.403, 3.740; Cal. Standards of Judicial Administration, std. 3.10
CM-010 [Rev. July 1, 2007]		www.courtinfo.ca.gov

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 plaintiffs designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made he 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 Maipractice (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

Other PI/PD/WD

Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort **Business Tort/Unfair Business**

⊢ Practice (07) Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination,

false arrest) (not civil harassment) (08)

Defamation (e.g., slander, libel)

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

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

Other Judicial Review (39) Review of Health Officer Order

Writ-Other Limited Court Case

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 (nondomestic relations)

Sister State Judgment Administrative Agency Award

(not unpaid taxes)

Petition/Certification of Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Taxes Other Enforcement of Judgment

Case

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

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: JURY TRIAL? ✓ YES CLASS ACTION? ☐ YES LIMITED CASE? ☐ YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 5-7 ☐ HOURS/ ☑ D	ΑY
Item II. Indicate the correct district and courthouse location (4 steps – If you checked "Limited Case", skip to Item III, Pg.	
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. May be filed in central (other county, or no bodily injury/property damage). Location where petitioner resides. Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred. Location where performance required or defendant resides. 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.

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Auto Tort	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.
roper th Tor	Product Liability (24)	□ A7250 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
al Injury/ P ongful Dea	Medical Malpractice (45)	□ A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons □ A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4. 1., 4.
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.

LACIV 109 (Rev. 03/11) LASC Approved 03-04 Amert v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, et al.

CASE NUMBER

Civil Case Cover Sheet Type of Action (Check only one) Category No. ☐ A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract) **Business Tort (07)** Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort Non-Personal Injury/ Property ☐ A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination Civil Rights (08) Defamation (13) □ A6010 Defamation (slander/libel) Fraud (16) □ A6013 Fraud (no contract) ☐ A6017 Legal Malpractice Professional Negligence (25) ☐ A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal) A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort Other (35) A6037 Wrongful Termination =mployment Wrongful Termination (36) A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case Other Employment (15) ☐ A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals ☐ A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful Breach of Contract/ Warranty ☐ A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach-Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) (06)(not insurance) □ A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) ☐ A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence) Contract A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff Collections (09) ☐ A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex) Insurance Coverage (18) ٦ A6009 Contractual Fraud A6031 Tortious Interference Other Contract (37)(□ A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence) Eminent Domain/Inverse Number of parcels □ A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Condemnation (14) Real Property Wrongful Eviction (33) ☐ A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case ☐ A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure A6032 Quiet Title Other Real Property (26) Ċ A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure) Unlawful Detainer-Commercial □ A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction) Unlawful Detainer-Residential □ A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction) (32)Unlawful Detainer-A6020F Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure Post-Foreclosure (34)

ไUniawful Detainer I

☐ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs

Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)

Applicable Reasons -

See Step 3 Above

1., 2., 3.

1., 2., 3.

1., 2., 3.

1., 2., 3.

1., 2., 3.

1., 2., 3.

1., 2., 3.

10.

2., 5.

2., 5.

1., 2., 5.

1., 2., 5.

2., 5., 6.

1., 2., 5., 8.

1., 2., 3., 5.

1., 2., 3., 5.

1., 2., 3., 8.

2.

2., 6.

2., 6.

2., 6.

2., 6.

2., 6.

2., 6.

2.. 6.

2. 6.

2., 5.

2.,3.

Albert v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, et al.

CASE NUMBER

_			
	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B 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.
7	Other Judicial Review (39)	□ A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
Ē	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	☐ A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
itigatío	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.
Σ	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.
ませ		☐ A6160 Abstract of Judgment	2., 6.
Enforcement of Judgment	Enforcement	☐ A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations)	2., 9.
forc Jud	of Judgment (20)	☐ A6149 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes)	2., 8.
g 2	,	A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax	2., 8.
		A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 8., 9.
ts s	RICO (27)	A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Complaints		☐ A6030 Declaratory Relief Only	1., 2., 8.
ellar Com	Other Complaints	☐ A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment)	2., 8.
Misc vil ((Not Specified Above) (42)	☐ A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8.
<u>- 0</u>		☐ A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8.
}	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	☐ A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
Miscellaneous Givil-Petition's 🖯		☐ A6121 Civil Harassment	2., 3., 9.
		☐ A6123 Workplace Harassment	2., 3., 9.
	045-50	☐ A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case	2., 3., 9.
scell Vijt	Other Petitions . (Not Specified Above)	☐ A6190 Election Contest	2.
_	(43)	☐ A6110 Petition for Change of Name	2., 7.
Î 😅		☐ A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law	2., 3., 4., 8.
0		☐ A6100 Other Civil Petition	2., 9.
}− -1		<u></u>	

(x)

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER
Albert v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, et al.	

Item III. Statement of Location: Enter the address of the accident, party's residence or place of business, performance, or other circumstance indicated in Item II., **Step 3** on Page 1, as the proper reason for filing in the court location you selected.

			ADDRESS:
REASON: Check the appropriate boxes for the numbers shown under Column C for the type of action that you have selected for this case.			393 East Walnut
□1. □2. ☑3. □4. 〔	□5. □6. □7. □8. □]9. □10.	
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP CODE:	
Pasadena	CA	91106	
Item IV. Declaration of Ass	ignment: I declare unde	er penalty of pe	erjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true
O			ed for assignment to the Los Angeles courthouse in the rnia, County of Los Angeles Court Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local
Rule 2.0, subds. (b), (c) an	•		That, County of 203 Angulas (1868) Olv. 1 100., § 502 of seq., and 2000
Dated: October 17, 2013	3		Phloh
			(SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PARTY)

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

- Original Complaint or Petition.
- 2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
- 3. Civil Case Cover Sheet, Jodicial 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.
- 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.

C

N C

(ii)