1 2 3 4	R. Craig Clark (SBN 129219) James M. Treglio (SBN 228077) Laura M. Cotter (SBN 259445) CLARK LAW FIRM 205 W Date Street San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: (619) 239-1321			
5	Facsimile: (888) 273-4554			
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13	Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class			
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
15	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
1617	RONIE RICHIE, an individual, on behalf of herself, and those similarly situated and on behalf of the general public,	CASE NO. CV 13 2693 EMC CLASS ACTION		
18	Plaintiff,	FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR		
19	v.	DAMAGES, RESTITUTION AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF:		
20	BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA is a	(1) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE FOR		
21	California Corporation, and DOE 1-100,	BUSINESS EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §2802		
22	Defendants.	(2) FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME IN		
2324		VIOLATION OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201, 207, 216 ("FLSA");		
25		(3) UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF.		
26		CODE § 17200 et seq.;		
27		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		
28				

Comes now RONIE RICHIE (PLAINTIFF), on behalf of herself and all persons similarly situated, allege as follows:

This class action is brought on behalf of all present and former Claims Processors against BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA ("BLUE SHIELD" or "DEFENDANT") in California. All allegations in this Complaint are based upon information and belief except for those allegations, which pertain to the PLAINTIFF named herein and his counsel. Each allegation in this Complaint has evidentiary support or is likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation and discovery.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. The Court has federal subject matter jurisdiction over this case pursuant to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.*, including under §§ 207, 216 and 217. Venue is appropriate in this district as the Plaintiff serviced retail stores on behalf of the Defendant within this District, and all acts occurred herein.
- 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that the putative class includes hundreds of employees of defendant with average damages in excess of \$13,000 each, and that the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest, wait time penalties, and costs. Therefore, the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, the sum specified by 28 U.S.C. 1332 (d) (1).

COLLECTIVE ACTION DEFINITION

3. The Collective Class consists of all persons who are current and former employees of DEFENDANT and who held the position of Claims Processor while employed in California by DEFENDANT and worked overtime times hours which were unpaid under FLSA, 29 USC §201, et seq. and incurred business expenses, office expenses (e.g. phone and internet expenses) and mileage during the period commencing in the date that is within four years prior to the filing of this complaint and through the present date the "Class Period"), and who were not fully reimbursed pursuant to the applicable laws. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the Class against the DEFENDANT, the Class period should be adjusted accordingly. Alternatively, PLAINTIFF request that the Court certify the CLASS for above described positions as follows:

- 3.1. All present and former claims processors employed by DEFENDANT who incurred expenses during the performance of their duties and who were not reimbursed for those expenses; and
- 3.2 All present and former claims processors employed by DEFENDANT who incurred Overtime as defined by FLSA 29 USC §201, *et seq* .for which they were not reimbursed

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 4 PLAINTIFF at all material times mentioned herein, allege:
- 4.1 PLAINTIFF Ronie Richie at all material times mentioned herein, is:
 - (a) An individual who resides in the Oroville in the State of California;
 - (b) Was employed as a Claims Processor for DEFENDANT;
 - (c) Incurred expenses and did not receive reimbursement from Defendant
 - (d) Worked overtime hours under FLSA and did not receive reimbursement from DEFENDANT and,
- (e) Was a member of the Class as defined in paragraphs 3, 3.1 and 3.2 of this Complaint.
- 5. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a Class Action as set forth in Federal Rule of Procedure 23, in that:
 - (a) The persons who comprise the CLASS are so numerous that the joinder of all such persons is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as a class will benefit the parties and the Court;
 - (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that are raised in this Complaint are common to the CLASS and will apply uniformly to every member of the CLASS, and as a practical matter be dispositive of interests of the other members not party to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests.
 - (c) The parties opposing the CLASS have acted or refuse to act on grounds generally applicable to the CLASS, thereby making appropriate final injunctive

- relief or corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the CLASS as a whole; and
- (d) Common questions of law and fact exist as to the members of the CLASS and predominate over any question affection only individual members, and a Class Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of
- 1) The interests of the members of the CLASS in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions;
- 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by or against members of the CLASS;
- 3) The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in the particular forum; and
- 4) The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a Class Action.
- 6. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure because:
 - (a) The questions of law and fact common to the CLASS predominate over any question affecting only individual members;
 - (b) A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the CLASS;
 - (c) The members of the CLASS are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the CLASS before the Court;
 - (d) PLAINTIFFS, and the other CLASS members, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a Class Action;
 - (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief for the common law and statutory violations and other improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries which BLUE SHIELD actions have inflicted upon the CLASS;

- (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets and available insurance of BLUE SHIELD are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- (g) BLUE SHIELD has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CLASS, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to the CLASS as a whole.

DEFENDANTS

- 7. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believes thereupon alleges that at all times mentioned herein that DEFENDANT is a corporation licensed to do business and actually doing business in the State of California. BLUE SHIELD is California corporation.
- 8. DEFENDANT conduct and continues to conduct substantial business in the state of California.
- 9. BLUE SHIELD owns and operates a business establishment within the State of California, and specifically within this judicial district, for purposes of providing insurance to residents of California.
- 10. DEFENDANT is subject to FLSA, California Labor Code section 2802 et seq., California Business and Professions Code section 17200 et seq., (Unfair Practices Act), and the applicable wage order(s) issued by the industrial Welfare Commission of the State of California, as to its employment relationship with its employees working in California and nationwide because it currently maintains and at all relevant times maintains

THE CONDUCT

- 11. PLAINTIFF Ronie Richie was employed by BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA.

 PLAINTIFF worked for DEFENDANT from October 15, 2001 until November 7, 2011. She held the position of Claims Processor and worked from home on a telecommuting basis from 2005 until November 2011. She began in the office in October 2001. She was paid on an hourly basis.
- 12. PLAINTIFF was also required to travel to meetings twice per month and was not reimbursed for mileage. She also incurred other business expenses such as phone, internet, and other office expenses.

- 13. Also as part of her job duties, PLAINTIFF would work overtime hours each day for which she was not compensated fully.
- 14. DEFENDANT, knew, or should have known, that she incurred these expenses and worked additional overtime hours for which she was not compensated.

FIRST COUNT

FOR FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR BUSINESS EXPENSES

[Cal. Lab. Code §2802]

(By the Class and Against Defendant)

- 15. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CLASS, realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the preceding paragraphs of this Amended Complaint.
- 16. Cal. Lab. Code §2802 provides that employers shall reimburse employees for all expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.
- 17. BLUE SHIELD required PLAINTIFF, and other members of the CLASS, to purchase office supplies such as phone and internet service, and to drive to monthly regional meetings.
- 18. PLAINTIFF, and other members of the CLASS, regularly incurred mileage expenses as a result of the requirement to travel, and other home office expenses.
- 19. BLUE SHIELD intentionally and consistently failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other members of the CLASS, for expenses incurred in the performance of their duties, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §2802.
- 20. Moreover, and as the Court in *Stuart v. RadioShack* (N.D. Cal. 2009) 641 F. Supp. 2d 901, recently held, , as the DEFENDANT employer of PLAINTIFF and other members of the CLASS, had a duty of due diligence to determine whether or not PLAINTIFF and other members of the CLASS incurred expenses during the course of their duties, and to reimburse them for those expenses. BLUE SHIELD completely and utterly failed to do so. Rather, it burdened PLAINTIFF, and other members of the CLASS, with a reimbursement policy that delayed reimbursement by weeks, if not months.

21. PLAINTIFF, and other members of the CLASS, is entitled and seek to recover the full amount of the expenses they incurred, plus interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

SECOND COUNT

FOR FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME COMPENSATION

[FLSA 29 USC §201, et seq.]

(By CLASS and against Defendant)

- 22. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the preceding paragraphs of this Amended Complaint.
 - 23. 29 U.S.C. § 207 (a)(1) provides in pertinent part:

 Except as otherwise provided in this section, no employer shall employ any of his employees who in any workweek is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or is employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, for a workweek longer than forty hours unless such employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of the hours above specified at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed
 - 24. Defendant is engaged in commerce within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 203 (b)
- 25. At all times relevant hereto, from time to time, the PLAINTIFF, and other members of the CLASS more than forty hours in a work week.
- 26. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant failed to pay PLAINTIFF, and other members of the CLASS, the overtime compensation premium for the hours they have worked in excess of the maximum hours permissible by law as required by FLSA
- 27. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay the lawful rate of compensation to the PLAINTIFF, and other members of the CLASS, for their overtime hours, the PLAINTIFF, and other members of the CLASS, have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to them but which exceed the jurisdictional limits of this Court and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.
- 28. PLAINTIFF, and other members of the CLASS, are informed and believe, and based upon that information and belief allege, that Defendant knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF, and other members of the CLASS, were being required to report their overtime hours

as regular time, and thus, miscalculated the appropriate rate of pay under Cal. Lab. Code §510.

- 29. DEFENDANT acted and is acting intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward the PLAINTIFF, and other members of the CLASS, with a conscious disregard of their rights, or the consequences to them, with the intent of depriving them of property and legal rights and otherwise causing them injury.
- 30. PLAINTIFF, and other members of the CLASS, request recovery of overtime compensation according to proof, interest, attorney's fees and cost, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the Cal. Lab. Code and/or other statutes.
- 31. Further, PLAINTIFF, and other members of the CLASS, is entitled to seek and recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to all applicable laws.

THIRD COUNT

FOR UNLAWFUL BUSINESS PRACTICES

[Cal. Bus. and Prof. Code §§ 17200 et seq.]

(By The CLASS and against Defendant)

- 32. The PLAINTIFFS realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, paragraphs 1 through 21 of this Amended Complaint.
- 33. BLUE SHIELD is a "person" as that term is defined under California Business & Professions Code § 17201.
- 34. Cal. Bus. and Prof. Code § 17200 defines unfair competition as "any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice".
- 35. At all times relevant hereto, by and through the conduct described herein, BLUE SHIELD has engaged in unfair and unlawful practices by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CLASS for mileage incurred during the performance of their duties, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 *et seq.*, and has thereby deprived PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CLASS, of fundamental rights and privileges owed to them by law.
 - 36. By and through the unfair and unlawful business practices described herein, BLUE

SHIELD has obtained valuable property, money, and services from the PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CLASS, and has deprived them of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

- 37. All the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the Cal. Lab. Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order, are unlawful and in violation of public policy; and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous, and thereby constitute unfair and unlawful business practices in violation of Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code § 17200 *et seq*.
- 38. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CLASS, are entitled to, and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to restore to them the money and property which Defendant BLUE SHIELD has acquired, or of which PLAINTIFF, and other members of The CLASS, have been deprived, by means of the above described unfair and unlawful business acts and practices.
- 39. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of The CLASS, are further entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair and unlawful and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining BLUE SHIELD from engaging in any of the above described unfair and unlawful business practices in the future.
- 40. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CLASS, have no plain, speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which they have suffered as a consequence of the unfair and unlawful business practices of BLUE SHIELD. As a result of the unfair and unlawful business practices described above, PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CLASS, have suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless BLUE SHIELD is restrained from continuing to engage in these unfair and unlawful business practices. In addition, BLUE SHIELD should be required to disgorge the unpaid moneys to PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CLASS.

1 **PRAYER** 2 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against BLUE SHIELD in favor of 3 PLAINTIFF and the CLASS as follows: 4 5 1. ON FIRST COUNT 6 A) For damages according to proof, as set forth in Cal. Lab. Code §2802, regarding 7 reimbursement due; 8 B) For interest owed on all expenses paid by PLAINTIFF and other members of the 9 CLASS, at the statutory rate of interest, and not previously reimbursed; 10 C) For reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs as proscribed by Cal. Lab. Code 11 §2802. 12 13 2. ON THE SECOND COUNT 14 A) For compensatory damages, including lost wages, commissions, bonuses, and other 15 losses, according to proof; 16 B) For general damages, according to proof; 17 C) For an award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate; 18 D) For statutory damages, including reasonable attorneys' fees and cost of suit. 19 20 ON THE THIRD COUNT **3.** 21 A) For restitution and disgorgement; 22 B) For injunctive relief ordering the continuing unfair business acts and practices to 23 cease, or as the Court otherwise deems just and proper; 24 C) For other injunctive relief ordering DEFENDANT to notify The CLASS that they 25 have not been paid the proper amounts required in accordance with California law. 26 4. ON ALL COUNTS 27 A) An Order conditionally certifying and then finally certifying the Collective Class, 28 approving PLAINTIFF as the Representative of the CLASS, and permitting this case to

1	proceed as a class action; and,			
2	B) For such other and further relief as the Court deem just and proper.			
3	b) for such other and further fence	as the Court of	can just and proper.	
4	Datad Daggerlan 2, 2012		CLADIZIAWEDW	
5	Dated: December 2, 2013		CLARK LAW FIRM	
6		By:	Laurer Colles	
7			R. Craig Clark James M. Treglio	
8			Laura M. Cotter	
9			Attorney for Plaintiffs	
	D			
10	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL			
11	PLAINTIFF demands jury trial on issues triable to a jury.			
12	Dated: December 2, 2013		CLARK LAW FIRM	
13	Dated. December 2, 2013		CLARK LAW FIRM	
14		By:	Lama Cotto	
15		•	R. Craig Clark James M. Treglio	
16			Laura M. Cotter	
17			Attorney for Plaintiffs	
18				
19				
20				
21				
ll ll				
22	•			
22 23				
23	•			
23 24				
23 24 25				
23 24 25 26				
23 24 25				

DECLARATION OF SERVICE 1 RONIE RICHIE v. BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA 2 United States District Court-Central District Case No. CV13 2693 EMC 3 I am employed in the county of San Diego, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this action. My business address is 600 B Street, Suite 4 2130, San Diego, CA 92101. On December 2, 2013, I served the document(s) described as: **(1)** FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT; 6 on the following interested parties and in the manner as follows: 7 8 Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP Sharon B. Bauman (Bar No. CA 179312) E-mail: sbauman@manatt.com Christopher A. Rheinheimer (Bar. No. CA 253890) 10 E-mail: CRheinheimer@manatt.com Embarcadero 30th Floor 11 Center, San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 291-7400 Facsimile: (415) 291-7474 12 13 Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP Andrew L. Satenberg (Bar No. CA 174840) E-mail: ASatenberg@manatt.com 14 11355 West Olympic Boulevard 15 Los Angeles, CA 90064-1614 Telephone: (310) 312-4000 Facsimile: (310) 312-4224 16 17 Attorneys for Defendant BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA 18 19 BY ELECTRONIC ACCESS: pursuant to Electronic Filing General Order 08-02 and Local Rule 5-4, I hereby certify that the above \boxtimes 20 documents were uploaded to the ECF website and will be posted on the 21 Website by the close of the next business day and the webmaster will give e-mail notification to all parties. 22 **BY U.S. MAIL:** by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed 23 envelope for collection and mailing following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with our ordinary business practices for collecting and processing mail for the United States Postal Service, and 24 mail that I place for collection and processing is regularly deposited 25 with the United States Postal Service that same day with postage prepaid. 26 **BY PERSONAL SERVICE:** by causing the document(s) listed above to be delivered by hand to offices of the addressee(s). 27 28 **BY FACSIMILE:** by causing to be transmitted via facsimile the document(s)

1	listed above to the addressee(s) at the facsimile number(s) set forth above.	
2	BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY: by enclosing the document(s) in an envelope or package provided by an overnight delivery carrier and addressed to the person(s) at the addresses listed above. I placed the envelope or	
3 4	to the person(s) at the addresses listed above. I placed the envelope or package for collection and overnight delivery at an office or a regularly utilized drop box of the overnight delivery carrier.	
5		
6	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct and that this Declaration was executed on December 2, 2013, at San Diego, California.	
7		
8	<u>/S/ Elizabeth Wilton</u> Elizabeth Wilton	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2	
	DECLARATION OF SERVICE	