

COPY

1 Edward J. Wynne, Esq. {165819}  
2 J.E.B. Pickett, Esq. {154294}

3 **RIGHETTI ♦ WYNNE**  
4 456 Montgomery Street, 14th Floor  
5 San Francisco, CA 94104  
6 Tel.(415) 983-0900  
7 Fax.(415) 397-9005

8 Edward S. Zusman {154366}  
9 **MARKUN ZUSMAN & COMPTON LLP**  
10 465 California Street, 5th Floor  
11 San Francisco, California 94104  
12 Tel: (415) 438-4515  
13 Fax: (415) 434-4505

14 Counsel for Plaintiff

**CONFORMED COPY**  
OF ORIGINAL FILED  
Los Angeles Superior Court

SEP 15 2005

John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk

By J. SUNGA, Deputy

15 **SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,**

16 **LOS ANGELES COUNTY**

17 ROBERT BURAKOFF, individually and on )  
18 behalf of all others similarly situated, )

19 Plaintiff, )

20 vs. )

21 WACHOVIA CORPORATION and Does 1 )  
22 through 50, inclusive, )

23 Defendants. )

No. BC339914

COMPLAINT

[CLASS ACTION]

1. Restitution of overtime wages [B&P 17200]

2. Restitution of overtime wages [B&P 17200]

3. Restitution of wage deductions [B&P

17200]

4. Waiting time penalties [Labor Code 203]

5. Meal and rest breaks [Labor Code 226.7]

[JURY TRIAL DEMANDED]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

1. Plaintiff ROBERT BURAKOFF is an individual residing in the State of California.

2. Defendant WACHOVIA CORPORATION is an entity of unknown form and origin doing business in the judicial district.

3. Plaintiff is unaware of the names and capacities of those defendants sued as DOES 1 through 50 but will amend this complaint when that information becomes known. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, each of the defendants, including the DOE defendants, was the officer, director, employee, agent representative, alter ego, or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, and in engaging in the conduct alleged herein, was acting in the course and scope of, and in furtherance of, such relationship.

4. Venue is proper in Los Angeles County as at least some of the acts complained of herein occurred in Los Angeles County as Defendants conduct business in Los Angeles County.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

5. Class Definition. Plaintiff worked for as a securities broker. Plaintiff seeks to bring this lawsuit as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The class that plaintiff seeks to represent is defined as follows: "All individuals who were employed by defendant as securities brokers or broker trainees in the State of California at any time during the period commencing on the date that is four years preceding the filing of the original complaint up to the time the case is certified as a class action." Plaintiff further seeks to subdivide the class into the following subclasses:

A. "Subclass A" consists of all class members who were paid on a commission—

1 only basis and, during the Class Period, worked more than 40 hours in a week, but did not  
2 receive overtime pay.

3 B. "Subclass B" consists of all class members were paid by salary (including  
4 salary plus commission or salary plus bonus) and, during the Class Period, worked more than  
5 40 hours in a week or 8 hours in a day, but did not receive overtime pay.  
6

7 C. "Subclass C" consists of all class members who, during the Class Period, were  
8 subject to at least one deduction from commissions or other wages, which deduction was not  
9 the result of a dishonest, willful, or grossly negligent act by the employee.  
10

11 D. "Subclass D" consists of all members of Subclass A, Subclass B, and/or  
12 Subclass C who, as of the date this lawsuit was filed, were no longer employed by defendant.

13 6. Ascertainable Class. The proposed class and each subclass are ascertainable in  
14 that their member can be identified and located using information contained in defendant's  
15 payroll and personnel records.  
16

17 7. Common Questions of Fact or Law. This lawsuit is suitable for class treatment  
18 because common questions of fact and law predominate over individual issues. Common  
19 questions include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) whether the class members qualify  
20 for exempt status under the inside salesperson exemption; (2) whether the class members  
21 qualify for exempt status under the administrative exemption; (3) whether defendant's business  
22 qualifies as a "retail or service establishment"; (4) the extent to which defendant analyzed the  
23 duties and responsibilities of the class members before classifying them as exempt; (5) the  
24 number of hours per week and per day class members are expected to work; (6) defendant's  
25 expectations as to the duties and responsibilities of the class members, and whether these  
26 expectations are reasonable under the circumstances; and (7) defendant's policies and  
27 expectations are reasonable under the circumstances; and (7) defendant's policies and  
28 procedures for deducting from the commissions or other wages was willful under the meaning

1 of Labor Code section 203.

2 8. Numerosity. The plaintiff class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all  
3 members is impractical under the circumstances of this case. While the exact number of class  
4 members is unknown to plaintiff at this time, the number of class members can be readily  
5 determined by review of defendant's personnel records.  
6

7 9. Typically and Adequately. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the  
8 class members. Plaintiff suffered a similar injury as the other class members as a result of  
9 defendant's common practices regarding the payment of wages. In addition, plaintiff will fairly  
10 and adequately protect the interests of the members of the class. Plaintiff has no interests that  
11 are adverse to the interests of the other class members.  
12

13 10. Superiority. A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and  
14 efficient adjudication of this controversy since individual joinder of all members of the calls is  
15 impractical. Class action treatment will permit a large number of similarly situated persons to  
16 prosecute their common claims in a single forum simultaneously, efficiently, and without the  
17 unnecessary duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would  
18 engender. Furthermore, as the damages suffered by each individual member of the class may  
19 be relatively small, the expenses and burden of individual litigation would make it difficult or  
20 impossible for individual members of the class to redress the wrongs done to them, while an  
21 important public interest will be served by addressing the manner as a class action. The cost to  
22 the court system of adjudication of such individualized litigation would be substantial.  
23 Individualized litigation would also present the potential for inconsistent or contradictory  
24 judgments. Finally, the alternative of filing a claim with the California Labor Commissioner is  
25 not superior, given the lack of discovery in such proceedings, the fact that there are fewer  
26 available remedies, and the losing party has the right to a trial de novo in the Supreme Court.  
27  
28

1 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

2 (Restitution of Overtime Wages – On Behalf of Subclass A)

3 11. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 10.

4 12. The Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1) (“FLSA”), states that an  
5 employee must be paid overtime, equal to 1.5 times the employee’s regular rate of pay, for all  
6 hours worked in excess of 40 per week. Subclass A members are not “exempt” under the  
7 FLSA, because, *inter alia*, they are not paid on a salary basis, and defendant’s business does  
8 not qualify as a “retail or service establishment” under 29 U.S.C. section 207(i) and 29 C.F.R.  
9 sections 779.316 and 779.317.  
10

11 13. Defendant has committed an act of unfair competition by not paying the  
12 required overtime pay to the members of Subclass A.  
13

14 14. Pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code section 17203, plaintiff requests an order  
15 requiring defendant to make restitution of all overtime wages due to Subclass A, in an amount  
16 to be proved as trial.

17 SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

18 (Restitution of Overtime Wages – On Behalf of Subclass B)

19 15. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 14.

20 16. Wage Order 4-2001, 8 C.C.R. section 11040, states that an employee must be  
21 paid overtime, equal to 1.5 times the employee’s regular rate of pay, for all hours worked in  
22 excess of 40 per week or 8 per day. Subclass B members are not exempt because, *inter alia*,  
23 they are production workers, they do not spend a majority of their time on exempt tasks and  
24 they do not customarily and regularly exercise discretion and independent judgment in matters  
25 of consequence to defendant’s business.  
26

27 17. Defendant has committed an act of unfair competition by not paying the  
28 required overtime pay to the members of Subclass B.

1 18. Pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code section 17203, plaintiff requests an order  
2 requiring defendants to make restitution of all overtime wages due to Subclass B, in an amount  
3 to be proved at trial.

4  
5 THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

6 (Restitution of Wage Deductions – On Behalf of Subclass C)

7 19. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations contained in Paragraph 1 through 18.

8 20. Labor Code sections 221 and 2802, as well as various California Supreme Court  
9 and appellate court decisions, generally state than an employer may not deduct from or reduce  
10 an employee's wages for the purpose of shifting the employer's ordinary cost of doing business  
11 to the employee.

12 21. Defendant has subjected the members of Subclass C to illegal deductions from  
13 wages, which deductions were not the result of dishonest, willful, or grossly negligent acts by  
14 those employees, but instead were ordinary costs of doing business.

15 22. Defendant has committed an act of unfair competition by illegally deducting  
16 from the wages of Subclass C.

17 23. Pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code section 17203, plaintiff requests an order  
18 requiring defendant to make restitution of all unpaid wages due to Subclass C, in an amount to  
19 be proved at trial.

20  
21 FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

22 (Labor Code Penalties – By and On Behalf of All Subclasses)

23 24. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 23.

24 25. Plaintiff seeks to recover penalties on behalf of the members of Subclasses A, B,  
25 and C pursuant to the following Labor Code provisions:  
26  
27  
28



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28


PRAYER

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment against each defendant, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. For compensatory damages according to proof;
2. For an order requiring defendant to make restitution of all wages, including overtime wages, that were illegally withheld;
3. For interest according to proof;
4. For penalties as alleged herein
5. For reasonable attorney's fees; and,
6. For such other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: September 8, 2005


RIGHETTI WYNNE



Edward J. Wynne  
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated: September 8, 2005

MARKUN ZUSMAN & COMPTON LLP



Edward S. Zusman  
Attorneys for Plaintiff