	Case 3:18-cv-05813-JSC Document 113	3 Filed 07/01/21 Page 1 of 48	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Laura L. Ho (CA SBN 173179) lho@gbdhlegal.com Ginger Grimes (SBN 307168) ggrimes@gbdhlegal.com GOLDSTEIN, BORGEN, DARDARIAN & HO 155 Grand Avenue, Suite 900 Oakland, CA 94612 Tel: (510) 763-9800 Fax: (510) 835-1417 Attorneys for Plaintiffs. Proposed Class and Collective Members, and Aggrieved Employees [Additional counsel on following page] UNITED STATES D	DISTRICT COURT	
10			
11	DIMITRI DIXON and RYAN SELTZ,	Case No. 3:18-cv-05813-JSC	
12	individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT	
13	Plaintiffs,	1. Violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act	
14	VS.	2. Violations of California Overtime Law	
15 16	CUSHMAN & WAKEFIELD WESTERN, INC.,; CUSHMAN & WAKEFIELD, INC., and	3. Violations of California Meal Period Law	
17	CUSHMAN & WAKEFIELD, OF WASHINGTON, DC, INC., and DOES 1-50, inclusive,	4. Violations of California Rest Period Law	
18	Defendants.	5. Violations of California Business Expenses Reimbursement Law	
19		6. Violations of California Accurate Itemized Wage Statements Law	
20		<ul> <li>7. Violation of California Unfair Competition Law</li> </ul>	
21 22		8. Violation of the Private Attorney	
22		General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") 9. Violation of California Final Pay Law	
23		JURY TRIAL DEMANDED	
25			
26			
27			
28		]	

	Case 3:18-cv-05813-JSC Document 113 Filed 07/01/21 Page 2 of 48
1 2 3	Justin M. Swartz (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> ) jms@outtengolden.com Deirdre Aaron (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> ) daaron@outtengolden.com OUTTEN & GOLDEN, LLP
4	685 Third Avenue, 25th Floor New York, NY 10017
5	Tel: (212) 245-1000 Fax: (646) 509-2060
6	Jahan C. Sagafi (SBN 227887)
7	jsagafi@outtengolden.com Molly J. Frandsen (SBN 320094) mfrandsen@outtengolden.com
8 9	OUTTEN & GOLDEN, LLP One California Street, 12th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111
10	Tel: $(415) 638-8828$ Fax: $(415) 638-8810$
11	Paolo Meireles (pro hac vice application forthcoming)
12	pmeireles@shavitzlaw.com Shavitz Law Group, P.A.
13	951 Yamato Road, Suite 285 Boca Raton, FL 33431
14	Tel: (561) 447-8888
15	Attorneys for Plaintiffs. Proposed Class and Collective Members, and Aggrieved Employees
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT - CASE NO. 3:18-CV-05813-JSC 829636.11

Plaintiff Dimitri Dixon and Plaintiff Ryan Seltz ("Plaintiffs"), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, allege as follows:

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Plaintiff Dimitri Dixon brings this action individually, and in a representative capacity
 on behalf of all other similarly situated individuals (members of the California Class and Dixon
 Collective), against Defendants Cushman and Wakefield Western, Inc. ("C&W Western") and
 Cushman & Wakefield, Inc. ("C&W) for violations of several California Labor Code provisions
 ("Labor Code"), including Labor Code §§ 203, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 226, 1174, and California
 Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders 4-2001, Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 8, § 11040; and the Fair
 Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 *et seq*.

Plaintiff Ryan Seltz brings this action individually and in a representative capacity on
 behalf of all similarly situated individuals (members of the Seltz Collective) against Defendants C&W
 and Cushman and Wakefield, of Washington, DC, Inc. ("C&W DC") for violations of the FLSA.

Plaintiffs, Class Members, and Collective Action Members were employed as
 Appraisers (including as Junior Appraisers and Senior Appraisers) by one or more Defendants and
 were denied the benefits and protections required by the FLSA, Labor Code, and other statutes and
 regulations applicable to non-exempt employees in the State of California.

18

4.

1

2

3

Plaintiffs allege that Defendants failed to:

19

a. Properly classify employees as non-exempt under California law and the FLSA;

b. Pay Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members all overtime wages for hours worked in
excess of eight (8) hours a day and to pay Plaintiffs, Class Members, and Collective Action Members
all overtime wages for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours a week;

23 |

c. Provide Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members mandated meal periods;

24

d. Provide Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members mandated rest periods;

e. Reimburse Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members for all necessary expenditures
that they incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of work duties including, but not limited to,
the cost of cell phone usage required for work-related purposes;

1	f. Keep required payroll records that accurately show the total hours Plaintiff	
2	Dixon and Class Members worked, as well as the wages that should have been paid;	
3	g. Furnish Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members with accurate wage statements;	
4	h. Comply with the Unfair Competition Law ("UCL"), California Business &	
5	Professions Code § 17200 et seq.; and	
6	i. Comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), codified as	
7	California Labor Code § 2698 et seq.	
8	j. Pay Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members All Wages Due Upon Termination.	
9	JURISDICTION AND VENUE	
10	5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 1337 and	
11	diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332.	
12	6. This Court also has jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims under the FLSA pursuant to 29	
13	U.S.C. § 216(b).	
14	7. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the California claims pursuant to 28	
15	U.S.C. § 1367 because they are so closely related to the claims under the FLSA that they form part of	
16	the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.	
17	8. Venue is proper in the Northern District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.	
18	9. Plaintiff Dixon fulfilled the administrative prerequisites for filing suit under Labor Code	
19	§ 2699.3(a). Specifically, on June 4, 2018, Plaintiff Dixon submitted to the California Labor and	
20	Workforce Agency ("LWDA") via its website a notice describing the allegations set forth in this	
21	Complaint. A true and correct copy of the Notice (LWDA Case Number LWDA-CM-543235-18) is	
22	attached as Exhibit 1. On the same day, Plaintiff Dixon served a copy of the Notice on Defendant	
23	C&W Western. via certified mail, as shown in Exhibit 1. As of sixty-five (65) calendar days after	
24	submission of the Notice to the LWDA, the LWDA had provided no notice to Plaintiff Dixon	
25	regarding its intention to investigate (or not investigate) Plaintiff Dixon's claims. Plaintiff Dixon	
26	timely submitted a filing fee of \$75 to the LWDA. On August 14, 2018, Plaintiff Dixon submitted to	
27	the LWDA a notice describing additional allegations set forth in this Complaint. A true and correct	
28	copy of the Notice is attached as Exhibit 2. On the same day, Plaintiff Dixon served a copy of the	
	2	

1 Notice on Defendant C&W Western via certified mail, as shown in Exhibit 2. As of sixty-five (65) 2 calendar days after submission of the Notice to the LWDA, the LWDA has provided no notice to 3 Plaintiff Dixon regarding its intention to investigate (or not investigate) Plaintiff Dixon's claims. 4 Plaintiff Dixon timely submitted a filing fee of \$75 to the LWDA. On August 16, 2019, Plaintiff 5 Dixon submitted to the LWDA a notice describing additional allegations set forth in this Complaint. A 6 true and correct copy of the Notice is attached as Exhibit 3. On the same day, Plaintiff Dixon served a 7 copy of the Notice on Defendant C&W Western via certified mail, as shown in Exhibit 3. As of sixty-8 five (65) calendar days after submission of the Notice to the LWDA, the LWDA has provided no 9 notice to Plaintiff Dixon regarding its intention to investigate (or not investigate) Plaintiff Dixon's 10 claims. Plaintiff Dixon timely submitted a filing fee of \$75 to the LWDA.

11

#### **PARTIES**

10. Plaintiff Dimitri Dixon is an adult individual who resides in Tustin, CA. Plaintiff is a
"person" under California Business & Professions Code § 17201 and California Labor Code § 18.
Plaintiff was employed as an Appraiser Trainee<sup>1</sup> by C&W and worked in that capacity from September
2007 to December 10, 2018.

16 11. Plaintiff Ryan Seltz is an adult individual who resided in Washington, D.C. during his
17 employment for C&W as an Appraiser from approximately May 2017 through October 2017.

18 12. Defendant C&W is a commercial real estate services company. C&W is the parent 19 corporation of Defendant C&W Western, Defendant C&W DC., and related corporate entities in states 20 across the country, and together they employ Appraisers (including Junior Appraisers and Senior 21 Appraisers) like Plaintiffs. Upon information and belief, these entities have offices throughout the 22 country, including in Georgia, New York, Ohio, Illinois, Washington D.C., and Washington state, as 23 well as non-U.S. offices in locations such as London and Singapore. Defendants act as a single integrated enterprise that employed and/or jointly employed Plaintiffs and those similarly situated 24 25 during all relevant times.

- 26
- 27

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Ms. Dixon's official job title was "Associate Director," though she was referred to and identified as an "Appraiser Trainee" at all relevant times.

**FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS** 

13. Plaintiff Dixon was an employee of C&W and C&W Western, a commercial real estate services company. Plaintiff Dixon began working as an Appraiser Trainee on September 17, 2007. As an Appraiser Trainee, Plaintiff Dixon's duties included appraising the value of real estate investments, researching property sales, listings, and rentals, constructing financial models, researching financial information, preparing appraisals for firm clients, and inspecting property.

Plaintiff Dixon worked across several practice areas within C&W and C&W Western's
Valuation Advisory Group, and began working as an Appraiser Trainee in the Senior Housing practice
area, supervised by Ryan McCafferty. Upon information and belief, around June 2013, Plaintiff Dixon
transferred to the Auto Specialty practice area, supervised by Chris Kelsey. Plaintiff Dixon most
recently worked within C&W and C&W Western's Auto Specialty practice area.

12 15. Throughout her tenure at C&W and C&W Western, Plaintiff Dixon actively sought a
13 state-certified appraisal license. Plaintiff Dixon held an Appraiser Trainee license. Plaintiff Dixon's
14 licensure status affected the number of C&W and C&W Western projects that she could complete.

15 16. Plaintiff Dixon was compensated through a "recoverable draw" scheme. At the 16 beginning of each year of her employment, Plaintiff Dixon was required to sign a standard promissory 17 note with C&W and C&W Western, where she agreed to pay C&W and C&W Western the balance of a fixed sum of money equal to her annual compensation. Each employee then receives a bi-monthly 18 19 draw against this obligation, which is the sole basis of compensation. Such "draw" payments 20 constitute advancements to Plaintiff Dixon, which Plaintiff owes to C&W and C&W Western in the 21 form of debt. The promissory note allows C&W and C&W Western, among other things, to recoup the 22 entire balance of the advanced sum at any time, including after the employee-employer relationship 23 terminates.

Appraisers work on assigned projects that generate fees. Such fees are intended, in part,
to cover their bi-monthly draw payments and satisfy outstanding debt obligations. Employees earn
fees through a complicated fee arrangement, which is stipulated in their employment contracts. A
portion of the fees generated by employees – including Plaintiff Dixon – are set aside for C&W and
C&W Western to account for and offset various accrued expenses and costs, including referral fees,

829636.11

4 SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT - CASE NO. 3:18-CV-05813-JSC

#### Case 3:18-cv-05813-JSC Document 113 Filed 07/01/21 Page 7 of 48

supervisory offsets and other miscellaneous costs. Upon information and belief, beginning around June 2013, fees earned by Plaintiff Dixon for completed projects were significantly reduced due to "supervisory offsets."

18. Upon information and belief, C&W and C&W Western calculates the total fee amount
generated by Appraisers (minus any deductions made pursuant to the employment contract), as well as
the total amount of draw payments made that period; the draw payments are then deducted from the
fees collected. Any positive amount is paid to the employee. Any negative amount is carried forward
as debt owed to C&W and C&W Western, which must be settled by appraisers.

9 19. Plaintiff Dixon's employment contract states that she may not receive less than the draw
payments. The employment contract further states that the draw payments "are loans to be repaid to
C&W upon demand." The employment contract states that if an Appraiser's fee share does not
sufficiently reimburse C&W and C&W Western for their advanced draw payments, employees are
personally liable to C&W and/or C&W Western.

Plaintiff Dixon has consistently carried forward a deficit while working for C&W.
Plaintiff Dixon worked on C&W and C&W Western projects with the goal of settling mounting
deficits resulting from the combined draw payments and promissory note obligations.

17 21. In 2017, C&W and/or and C&W Western held a promissory note against Plaintiff
18 Dixon for \$54,000, which was equal to the total bi-monthly draw payments received throughout the
19 year.

20 22. Plaintiff Dixon repeatedly alerted her supervisors that her deficit was beginning to grow
and that the fee split with her supervisor precluded Plaintiff Dixon from settling the outstanding debt
obligations. Plaintiff Dixon made two suggestions as ways to settle her obligations: (1) C&W and/or
C&W Western should increase her fee share and/or (2) she should be given additional projects to earn
more fees. Upon information and belief, as of December 2017, Plaintiff Dixon was only receiving
fifty (50) percent of the total fees generated, and otherwise continued receiving fewer and fewer
projects.

27 23. Upon information and belief, around December 2017, after Plaintiff Dixon discussed
28 her decreasing project volume with Lars Platt, a regional leader at C&W and/or C&W Western, Mr.

1

2

1 Platt informed Plaintiff Dixon that there simply was not enough business to accommodate Plaintiff Dixon's request.

24. Upon information and belief, around December 2017, Michele Kauffman, a C&W and/or C&W Western area leader, and another one of Plaintiff Dixon's supervisors, told Plaintiff Dixon that she should continue to work on obtaining her appraiser license as a way to position herself for more projects at C&W and C&W Western.

25. On May 16, 2018, Plaintiff Dixon received an email stating that, effective June 4, 2018, Plaintiff Dixon's recoverable draw compensation would be reduced from \$54,000 to \$45,760, as Plaintiff Dixon had not performed enough work to settle the deficit owed to Defendants.

26. After a period of receiving few opportunities to conduct appraisals in late 2017 and early 2018, Plaintiff Dixon was told that she owed more than \$28,000 to C&W and/or C&W Western and that Plaintiff Dixon needed to figure out a way to reduce that figure.

13 27. Upon information and belief, on or around May 17, 2018, Plaintiff Dixon discussed 14 with Ms. Kauffman the low number of projects she was assigned and her growing draw deficit. Ms. 15 Kauffman told Plaintiff that C&W and C&W Western did not have work that she could perform, 16 explaining that only a handful of low-level assignments – with correspondingly lower fees – were 17 available. Additionally, Ms. Kauffman informed Plaintiff Dixon that such low-value assignments were 18 not projects that C&W, as a firm, typically took on.

19

28. Plaintiff Dixon's draw payments were stopped effective June 4, 2018.

29. 20Plaintiff Dixon's resulting stress, growing deficit, and feeling of helplessness caused 21 Plaintiff Dixon severe anxiety, chest pains, and depression. Because of these symptoms, Plaintiff 22 Dixon took medical leave.

30. 23 Upon information and belief, around 2010, Plaintiff Dixon's supervisor, Ryan 24 McCafferty, complained that Plaintiff Dixon did not possess a cell phone for work-related usage. 25 Based on McCafferty's complaint, Plaintiff Dixon obtained a cell phone, which she used for work-26 related purposes. At no point did C&W and/or C&W Western provide cell phones to Plaintiff Dixon 27 or similarly situated appraisers. C&W and C&W Western have never compensated Plaintiff Dixon for 28 expenses related to the continued use of her cell phone.

31. On April 15, 2019, Plaintiff Dixon was notified of her termination from C&W and
 C&W Western, effective December 10, 2018. Defendants alleged that Plaintiff owed a draw balance
 of \$15,632.54 and demanded repayment.

32. During the applicable time period, Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members regularly and
consistently worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday and/or more than forty (40) hours in a
workweek. Nonetheless, Defendants C&W and C&W Western failed to pay Plaintiff Dixon and Class
Members for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or in excess of forty (40)
hours in a workweek.

9 33. Defendants C&W and C&W Western failed to provide Plaintiff Dixon and Class
10 Members with meal and rest periods in accordance with California law.

34. Defendants C&W and C&W Western failed to keep accurate payroll records showing
the daily hours worked by Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members, as well as wages they should have been
paid.

14 35. Defendants C&W and C&W Western failed to furnish Plaintiff Dixon and Class
15 Members with accurate itemized wage statements in accordance with California law.

36. Defendants C&W and C&W Western misclassified Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members
as "exempt" employees.

18 37. Defendants C&W and C&W Western failed to pay Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members
19 all wages due upon termination.

20 38. C&W and C&W Western employed Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members during
21 PAGA's statutory period.

39. Plaintiff Seltz worked for C&W and C&W DC as an Appraiser in Washington, D.C.
from approximately May 2017 through October 2017. As an Appraiser, Plaintiff Seltz regularly
worked more than 40 hours per week and frequently worked approximately 55 hours per week, without
being paid overtime.

26

27

28

7 Second Amended Complaint - Case No. 3:18-cv-05813-JSC

	Case 3	3:18-cv-05813-JSC Document 113 Filed 07/01/21 Page 10 of 48
1		<b>COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS UNDER THE FLSA</b>
2	40.	Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and all Collective Action Members, re-allege and
3	incorporate by	y reference the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth
4	herein.	
5	41.	Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216, Plaintiffs seek to prosecute the FLSA claims as a
6	collective act	ion on behalf of two groups of Appraisers. Plaintiff Dixon represents the following
7	collective of A	Appraisers:
8		All persons employed by CUSHMAN AND WAKEFIELD WESTERN,
9		INC. and CUSHMAN AND WAKEFIELD, INC., as Appraisers (including and Senior Appraisers) assigned to at least one Cushman &
10		Wakefield office in any state between October 7, 2017 through May 31, 2021 ("Dixon Collective").
11	42.	Plaintiff Seltz represents the following collective of Junior Appraisers:
12		
13		All persons employed by CUSHMAN AND WAKEFIELD, INC., and CUSHMAN AND WAKEFIELD, OF WASHINGTON, DC, INC. as
14 15		Junior Appraisers or Associate Appraisers assigned to at least one Cushman &Wakefield office in any state between October 12, 2016 through September 9, 2019 ("Seltz Collective").
16		
17	43.	There are numerous similarly situated current and former Appraisers and Junior
18	Appraisers th	roughout the United States who would benefit from the issuance of a Court-supervised
19	notice. Those	e similarly situated employees are known to C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC and are
20	readily identi	fiable through C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC's records.
21	44.	Plaintiffs and the Collective Action Members of the Dixon Collective and the Seltz
22	Collective are	e similarly situated because, among other things, they all: (a) had the same duties; (b)
23	performed the	e same tasks; (c) were misclassified as exempt from overtime wages; (d) were paid under
24	the same emp	ployment contracts and promissory notes; (e) were required, suffered, or permitted to
25	work, and did	l work in excess of forty hours per week; and (f) were not paid at a rate of one and one-
26	half times the	eir regular rate of pay for all overtime hours worked.
27	45.	As part of its regular business practice, C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC
28	intentionally,	willfully, and repeatedly engaged in a uniform pattern, practice, and/or policy of
		8

#### Case 3:18-cv-05813-JSC Document 113 Filed 07/01/21 Page 11 of 48

violating the FLSA with respect to the Collective Action Members of the Dixon Collective and the
Seltz Collective. This policy and pattern or practice included, but is not limited to, willfully:
misclassifying Appraisers and Junior Appraisers as exempt from overtime wages; failing to pay
Appraisers and Junior Appraisers overtime wages for hours that they worked in excess of forty hours
per workweek; and failing to record all of the time that Appraisers and Junior Appraisers worked for
the benefit of C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC.

7 46. C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC were aware or should have been aware that
8 federal law requires it to pay employees an overtime premium for hours worked in excess of forty
9 hours per workweek.

47. C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC's deceptive conduct prevented Plaintiffs and all
other Collective Action Members from discovering or asserting their claims earlier than they did
because C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC, among other things, repeatedly declared that Appraisers
and Junior Appraisers were exempt from overtime.

14

#### CALIFORNIA CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

48. Plaintiff Dixon, on behalf of herself and all California Class Action Members, re-alleges
and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth
herein.

18 49. Plaintiff Dixon seeks to proceed as a class action with regard to their California law 19 claims pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 23 on behalf of the following class of persons: 20 All persons employed in California by CUSHMAN AND WAKEFIELD WESTERN, INC., and CUSHMAN AND WAKEFIELD, INC., as an 21 Appraiser (including Junior Appraisers and Senior Appraisers) assigned to at least one Cushman & Wakefield office between August 14, 2014 22 through May 31, 2021 ("California Class Action Members"). 23 50. Plaintiff Dixon reserves the right under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 15 of to 24

amend or modify the class description with greater specificity or further division into subclasses or limitation to particular issues.

26 27

28

25

51. **Numerosity**. The putative class is so numerous that joinder of all members is

impracticable. Although the precise number of such persons is unknown, and the facts on which the

#### Case 3:18-cv-05813-JSC Document 113 Filed 07/01/21 Page 12 of 48

calculation of that number would be based are within the sole custody and/or control of C&W and
 C&W Western, upon information and belief, C&W and C&W Western have employed over forty
 Appraisers in California within the last four years.

4	52.	<b>Commonality and Predominance</b> . Among the proposed class, there is a well-defined
5	community of	interest in the questions of law and/or fact involved. Common questions of law and/or
6	fact predominate over questions that affect only individual California Class Action Members.	
7	Common quest	ions include, but are not limited to:
8		a. Whether C&W and/or C&W Western is the employer of California Class Action
9	Members;	
10		b. Whether C&W and C&W Western's uniform classification of all California
11	Class Action M	lembers as exempt from overtime violated the California Labor Code;
12		c. Whether C&W and C&W Western owe California Class Action Members
13	overtime wages	s for hours worked greater than forty (40) in a week or eight (8) in a day;
14		d. Whether C&W and C&W Western failed to keep accurate payroll records of
15	hours worked,	meal and rest periods taken, and overtime worked in accordance with California law;
16		e. Whether C&W and C&W Western reimbursed California Class Action
17	Members for co	ell phone expenses for use during working hours;
18		f. Whether the wage statements C&W and C&W Western issued to California
19	Class Action N	lembers included all hours worked and/or rates of pay; and
20		g. Whether C&W and C&W Western's Labor Code violations serve as predicate
21	violations of th	e UCL;
22		h. Whether C&W and C&W Western failed to pay Plaintiff Dixon and Class
23	Members all w	ages due upon termination of employment.
24	53.	Typicality. Plaintiff Dixon's claims are typical of the claims of the Class as all Class
25	Members are si	milarly affected by C&W and C&W Western's wrongful conduct as complained of
26	herein. Plainti	ff Dixon was subjected to the same violations of her rights under the law and seeks the
27	same types of r	elief on the same theories and legal grounds as the members of the class she seeks to
28	represent.	
		10

54. Adequacy of Representation. Plaintiff Dixon will fairly and adequately represent and
 protect the interests of the Class Members. Plaintiff Dixon's interests are not in conflict with those of
 the Class. Plaintiff Dixon's counsel are competent and experienced in litigating large employment
 class actions and other complex litigation matters, including cases involving factual and legal claims
 similar to those alleged here.

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION Violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act [29 U.S.C. §§ 201 *et seq.*]

#### All Defendants

9 55. Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and all Collective Action Members, re-allege and
10 incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth
11 herein.

12 56. C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC have been, and continues to be, an employer
13 engaged in interstate commerce within the meaning of the FLSA of the employees identified by the
14 collectives defined herein.

15 57. C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC employed and/or continues to employ Plaintiffs
16 and each of the Collective Action Members within the meaning of the FLSA.

17 58. C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC has had annual gross revenues in excess of
18 \$500,000.

19 59. Plaintiffs expressly consent in writing to be a party to these collective actions pursuant
20 to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Plaintiff Dixon's written consent to join was previously filed with the Court.

21 60. Plaintiff Seltz filed a written consent to join a collective action under 29 U.S.C. §
22 216(b) in *Seltz v. Cushman & Wakefield, Inc.*, No. 1:18-cv-02092-BAH.

61. C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC has had a policy and practice of misclassifying
Appraisers and Junior Appraisers, including Plaintiffs and Collective Action Members, as exempt from
overtime wages.

26

6

7

8

27

C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC has had a policy and practice of refusing to pay
 any overtime compensation to Appraisers and Junior Appraisers for hours worked in excess of forty
 hours per week.

63. C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC have violated the FLSA, including §§ 207(a)(1)
and 215(a) because C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC willfully fail to compensate its Appraisers
and Junior Appraisers for all hours worked and at a rate not less than one and one-half times their
regular rate of pay for work performed in excess of forty hours in a workweek.

64. As a result of C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC's misclassification of its Appraisers
and Junior Appraisers and its attendant failure to record, report, credit, and/or compensate Plaintiffs
and Collective Action Members, C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC has failed to make, keep, and
preserve records with respect to each of its employees sufficient to determine the wages, hours, and
other conditions and practices of employment in violation of the FLSA, including §§ 211(c) and
215(a).

14 65. C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC's conduct, as alleged, constitutes a willful
15 violation of the FLSA within the meaning of the statute, 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

66. Due to C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC's FLSA violations, Plaintiffs, on behalf of
themselves and all Collective Action Members, are entitled to recover from C&W, C&W Western, and
C&W DC unpaid wages, as well as overtime compensation, an additional amount equal to the unpaid
wages and overtime as liquidated damages, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs pursuant to § 216(b)
of the FLSA, as well as further relief as described below.

21

- 22
- 23 24

25

26

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION Failure to Pay Overtime Wages [Cal. Labor Code §§ 510, 558, and 1194, and Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8 § 11040] Defendants C&W and C&W Western

67. Plaintiff Dixon, on behalf of herself and all California Class Action Members, re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

California Labor Code § 510 and Wage Order No. 4 requires an employer to
 compensate a non-exempt employee for all work performed in excess of eight hours per workday or

#### Case 3:18-cv-05813-JSC Document 113 Filed 07/01/21 Page 15 of 48

forty hours per workweek, at one and one-half times the employee's regular rate of pay.

69. Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members are non-exempt employees. Neither of the exemptions to California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders 4-2001, Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 8, § 11070 apply. During the relevant period, Plaintiff and Class Members have not earned a monthly salary equivalent to no less than two (2) times the State's minimum wage for full-time employment.

6 70. Plaintiff Dixon's entire compensation depends on fees generated from projects assigned 7 by C&W and C&W Western. Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members' ultimate compensation depends on 8 the quantity of work available. Therefore, Plaintiff and Class Members have not been paid on a salary 9 basis pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 541.602(a). See Ming-Hsiang Kao v. Joy Holiday, 12 Cal. App. 5th 947, 10 959 (2017) (since state "law was patterned to some extent on federal law, the general approach in 11 interpreting California law has been to use the federal salary basis test unless some other provision of 12 California law calls for a more protective standard"); DLSE Manual § 51.6.4 (detailing that the DLSE 13 will enforce the federal "salary basis test" to the extent that it does not conflict with "California 14 statutory law, case law, or public policy").

- Furthermore, because the promissory notes directly encumber Plaintiff Dixon and Class
  Members' compensation and allow Defendants to claw back disbursed payments, the compensation
  received by Plaintiff and Class Members were not made "free and clear" under 29 C.F.R. § 531.35, and
  thus do not constitutive a salary. See *Ming-Hsiang Kao*, 12 Cal. App. 5th at 959; see also, *Takacs v. A.G. Edwards and Sons, Inc.*, 444 F. Supp. 2d 1100, 1108 (S.D. Cal. 2006) (finding that a deficit owed
  to an employer because of diminished commissions made the employee's compensation conditional –
  not "free and clear" and therefore not a salary).
- 22 || 23 ||

1

2

3

4

5

72. C&W and C&W Western misclassified Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members as exempt employees.

73. During all relevant times, C&W and C&W Western required Plaintiff Dixon and
California Class Action Members to work in excess of eight hours per workday and forty hours per
workweek. C&W and C&W Western failed to pay the overtime wages that Plaintiff Dixon and
California Class Action Members earned.

28

74. Due to C&W and C&W Western's Labor Code violations, Plaintiff Dixon and Class

Members are entitled to recover from C&W and C&W Western unpaid overtime compensation, interest, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs pursuant to the California Labor Code, as well as further relief as described below.

#### <u>THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION</u> Failure to Provide Meal Periods [Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 1194, and Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8 § 11040] Defendants C&W and C&W Western

75. Plaintiff Dixon, on behalf of herself and all California Class Action Members, re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

76. California Labor Code § 512(a) states, "[a]n employer may not employ an employee for
a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of
not less than 30 minutes. An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than
10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30
minutes."

15 77. Wage Order No. 4 states, "[n]o employer shall employ any person for a work period of
16 more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes." If no meal period is
17 provided, the Wage Order requires the employer to "pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the
18 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided."

78. California Labor Code § 226.7 states, "[a]n employer shall not require an employee to
work during a meal ... period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation,
standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission." Section 226.7 requires an employer to pay
one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate if the meal or rest period is not provided.

79. Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members are non-exempt employees. Neither of the
exemptions to California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders 4-2001, Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 8,
§ 11070 apply. During the relevant period, Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members have not earned a
monthly salary equivalent to no less than two (2) times the State's minimum wage for full-time
employment.

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

80. Plaintiff Dixon's entire compensation depends on fees generated from projects assigned

#### Case 3:18-cv-05813-JSC Document 113 Filed 07/01/21 Page 17 of 48

by Defendants; Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members' ultimate compensation depends on the quantity of 1 2 work available. Therefore, Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members have not been paid on a salary basis 3 pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 541.602(a). See Ming-Hsiang Kao, 12 Cal. App. 5th at 959 (since state "law 4 was patterned to some extent on federal law, the general approach in interpreting California law has 5 been to use the federal salary basis test unless some other provision of California law calls for a more 6 protective standard"); DLSE Manual § 51.6.4 (detailing that the DLSE will enforce the federal "salary 7 basis test" to the extent that it does not conflict with "California statutory law, case law, or public 8 policy").

81. Furthermore, because the promissory notes directly encumber Plaintiff Dixon and Class
Members' compensation and allow Defendants C&W and C&W Western to claw back disbursed
payments, the compensation received by Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members were not made "free and
clear" under 29 C.F.R. § 531.35, and thus do not constitute a salary. *See Ming-Hsiang Kao*, 12 Cal.
App. 5th at 959; *see also, Takacs*, 444 F. Supp. 2d at 1108 (finding that a deficit owed to an employer
because of diminished commissions made the employee's compensation conditional – not "free and
clear" – and therefore not a salary).

16 82. C&W and C&W Western misclassified Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members as exempt
17 employees.

18 83. C&W and C&W Western do not have a policy or practice of providing meal periods to
19 California Class Action Members, and C&W and C&W Western has not paid employees premium pay
20 for missed meal periods as required by California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and Wage Order No.
21 4.

84. As a result of C&W and C&W Western's unlawful failure to provide meal periods to all
California Class Action Members and C&W and C&W Western's failure to pay an hour of premium
pay at the regular rate for each missed meal period, Plaintiff Dixon and California Class Action
Members are entitled to recover one hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday
that a meal period was not provided, plus interest, attorney's fees, and costs, as well as further relief as
described below.

#### FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION Failure to Provide Rest Periods [Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 1194, Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8 § 11040] Defendants C&W and C&W Western

85. Plaintiff Dixon, on behalf of herself and all California Class Action Members, re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

86. California Labor Code § 226.7 states, "[a]n employer shall not require an employee to work during a ... rest ... period," and "[i]f an employer fails to provide an employee a ... rest ... period ... the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the ... rest ... period is not provided."

87. Wage Order No. 4 states, "[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof." The Wage Orders require an employer to "pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided."

88. Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members are non-exempt employees. Neither of the exemptions to California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders 4-2001, Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 8, § 11070 apply. During the relevant period, Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members have not earned a monthly salary equivalent to no less than two (2) times the State's minimum wage for full-time employment.

89. Plaintiff Dixon's entire compensation depends on fees generated from projects assigned by Defendants; Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members' ultimate compensation depends on the quantity of work available. Therefore, Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members have not been paid on a salary basis pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 541.602(a). *See Ming-Hsiang Kao*, 12 Cal. App. 5th at 959 (since state "law was patterned to some extent on federal law, the general approach in interpreting California law has been to use the federal salary basis test unless some other provision of California law calls for a more protective standard"); DLSE Manual § 51.6.4 (detailing that the DLSE will enforce the federal "salary basis test" to the extent that it does not conflict with "California statutory law, case law, or public policy").

90. Furthermore, because the promissory notes directly encumber Plaintiff Dixon and Class
Members' compensation and allow Defendants C&W and C&W Western to claw back disbursed
payments, the compensation received by Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members were not made "free and
clear" under 29 C.F.R. § 531.35, and thus do not constitute a salary. *See Ming-Hsiang Kao*, 12 Cal.
App. 5th at 959; *see also, Takacs*, 444 F. Supp. 2d at 1108 (finding that a deficit owed to an employer
because of diminished commissions made the employee's compensation conditional – not "free and
clear" – and therefore not a salary).

10 91. C&W and C&W Western misclassified Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members as exempt
11 employees.

92. C&W and C&W Western do not have a policy or practice of providing rest periods to
California Class Action Members, and C&W and C&W Western has not paid employees premium pay
for missed rest periods as required by California Labor Code § 226.7 and Wage Order No. 4.

93. As a result of C&W and C&W Western's unlawful failure to provide rest periods to all
California Class Action Members and C&W and C&W Western's failure to pay an hour of premium
pay at the regular rate for each day a rest period was not provided, Plaintiff Dixon and California Class
Action Members are entitled to recover one hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each
workday that a rest period was not provided, plus interest, attorney's fees, and costs, as well as further
relief as described below.

# 21 22

1

2

- . .
- 23

#### FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses [Cal. Labor Code § 2802, and Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 11040, 11070] Defendants C&W and C&W Western

94. Plaintiff Dixon, on behalf of herself and all California Class Action Members, re-alleges
and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth
herein.

27 95. California Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to indemnify an employee for all
28 necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of

#### Case 3:18-cv-05813-JSC Document 113 Filed 07/01/21 Page 20 of 48

the employee's duties.

96. During all relevant times, C&W and C&W Western failed to indemnify Plaintiff Dixon and California Class Action Members for their expenses related to use of their personal cell phones for 4 work purposes. Plaintiff Dixon and California Class Action Members are entitled to indemnification of these work-related expenses plus prejudgment interest pursuant to California Labor Code § 2802. 97. Plaintiff Dixon, on behalf of herself and similarly situated California Class Action Members, requests relief for these violations and further relief as described below.

# 8 9

10

1

2

3

5

6

7

#### **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements** [Cal. Labor Code §§ 226 and 226.3, and Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8 § 11040] **Defendants C&W and C&W Western**

11 98. Plaintiff Dixon, on behalf of herself and all California Class Action Members, re-alleges 12 and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein. 13

99. California Labor Code § 226 provides that every employer must furnish each employee 14 with an itemized wage statement that shows the total numbers of hours worked each pay period, gross 15 16 wages, net wages, all deductions, all applicable hourly rates of pay, the legal name and address of the employer, and other information. 17

C&W and C&W Western failed to furnish Plaintiff Dixon and California Class Action 100. 18 19 Members itemized wage statements accurately showing, at a minimum, gross wages, total hours 20 worked, net wages earned, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period as well as the 21 number of hours corresponding to each hourly rate.

22 101. During all relevant times, all California Class Action Members were injured by these failures because, among other things, they were confused about whether they were paid properly, 23 and/or they were misinformed about how many total hours they worked during each pay period. 24

25 102. California Labor Code § 226(e)(1) states that an employee suffering injury as a result of 26 a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to provide accurate itemized wage statements is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages suffered or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial 27 28 violation and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each subsequent violation, up to four thousand dollars

(\$4,000). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h), Plaintiff Dixon and California Class Action
 Members are entitled to injunctive relief to ensure C&W's compliance with California Labor Code
 § 226.

4 103. Plaintiff Dixon and California Class Action Members are entitled to an award of costs
5 and reasonable attorneys' fees under California Labor Code § 226(h), as well as further relief as
6 described below.

# 7 8 9

#### <u>SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION</u> Unfair Competition Law Violations [Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*] Defendants C&W and C&W Western

10 104. Plaintiff Dixon, on behalf of herself and all California Class Action Members, re-alleges
and reincorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set
forth herein.

13 105. California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.* prohibits unfair competition
14 in the form of any unlawful, unfair, deceptive, or fraudulent business practices.

15 106. C&W and C&W Western has committed unlawful, unfair, deceptive, and/or fraudulent
acts as defined by California Business & Professions Code §17200. C&W and C&W Western's
unlawful, unfair, deceptive, and/or fraudulent business practices include, but are not limited to, failing
to pay for all hours worked, failing to pay overtime wages, failing to provide mandated meal and rest
periods, and failing to indemnify Appraisers for business expenses.

20 107. As a result of such unlawful, unfair, and/or fraudulent business practices, C&W and
21 C&W Western reaped ill-gotten benefits and illegal profits at the expense of Plaintiff Dixon and
22 California Class Action Members.

23 108. Plaintiff Dixon, on behalf of herself and similarly situated California Class Action
24 Members, requests further relief as described below.

#### EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION Violation of the Private Attorney General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") [Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*]

Defendant C&W Western

25

26

27

109. Plaintiff Dixon, on behalf of herself and all other aggrieved employees, re-alleges and
 incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth
 herein.

110. Plaintiff Dixon is an "aggrieved employee" under PAGA, as she was employed by
C&W Western during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more Labor Code violations.
As such, Plaintiff Dixon seeks to recover, on behalf of herself and all aggrieved employees, the civil
penalties provided by PAGA, plus reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

8 111. Plaintiff Dixon seeks to recover the PAGA civil penalties through a representative
9 action as permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in *Arias v. Super. Ct.*, 46 Cal. 4th 969
10 (Cal. Ct. App. 2009). Class certification of the PAGA claims is not required, but Plaintiff Dixon may
11 seek certification of the PAGA claims.

12 112. Plaintiff Dixon seeks to pursue remedies pursuant to PAGA for the following13 violations:

a. For C&W Western's failure to pay California Appraisers overtime, Plaintiff
Dixon seeks recovery of civil penalties as set forth in California Labor Code § 558. For C&W
Western's failure to provide California Appraisers with meal periods or rest periods, Plaintiff Dixon
seeks civil penalties under California Labor Code § 558.

b. For C&W Western's knowing and intentional failure to provide accurate wage
statements, California Labor Code § 226.3 imposes a civil penalty, in addition to any other penalty
provided by law, of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per aggrieved employee for the first violation of
California Labor Code § 226(a), and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per aggrieved employee for each
subsequent violation.

c. For C&W Western's failure to keep accurate records as required by California
Labor Code § 1174(d), including records of aggrieved employees' overtime hours, driving time, offsite work, weekend hours, holiday hours, and meal periods, C&W Western is subject to a civil penalty
of five hundred dollars (\$500) under California Labor Code § 1174.5. C&W Western is also liable for
civil penalties under California Labor Code § 558.

28

829636.11

d. For C&W Western's failure to indemnify California Appraisers for all necessary

business expenditures, C&W Western is liable for the amount civil penalties described in the paragraph below, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2802.

3 e. For C&W Western's willful failure to pay all wages to an employee who is 4 discharged or quits, the employee's wages continue from the due date at the same rate paid as a penalty 5 under California Labor Code § 203. The penalty does not continue for more than thirty (30) days. 6 California Labor Code § 256 imposes a civil penalty in an amount not exceeding thirty (30) days' pay.

7 California Labor Code § 2698 et seq. imposes a civil penalty of one hundred dollars 113. 8 (\$100) per pay period, per aggrieved employee for the initial violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 510, 9 512, 558, 1194, and 2802. For each subsequent violation, the penalty is two hundred dollars (\$200) 10 per aggrieved employee, per pay period.

11 114. True and correct copies of the claim notices filed online with the California Labor and 12 Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"), LWDA Case Number LWDA-CM-543235-18, copies of which were sent via certified mail to Defendant C&W Western, is attached as Exhibit 1, 2 and 3. As 13 14 of today's date, the LWDA has provided no notice to Plaintiff Dixon regarding its intention to 15 investigate or not investigate Plaintiff's claims.

16 115. Enforcement of statutory provisions to protect workers and to ensure proper and prompt 17 payment of wages is a fundamental public interest. Plaintiff Dixon's successful enforcement of 18 important rights affecting the public interest will confer a significant benefit for the general public. 19 Private enforcement of these rights is necessary, as no public agency has pursued enforcement.

20 116. As a result of the violations alleged, Plaintiff Dixon, an aggrieved employee, on behalf 21 of herself and other aggrieved employees, seeks all relief available pursuant to California Labor Code 22 § 2699, including all civil penalties, attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs.

#### NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION **Failure to Pay All Wages Upon Termination** [Cal. Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, and 256] **Defendants C&W and C&W Western**

117. Plaintiff Dixon, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, re-alleges and 26 incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein. 28

25

27

1

California Labor Code § 201 provides that any discharged employee is entitled to all 1 118. 2 wages due at the time of discharge.

3 119. California Labor Code § 202 provides that any employee who guits his or her 4 employment is entitled to all wages due within seventy-two (72) hours of notice of his intention to quit, 5 or at the time of quitting if the employee provided seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her 6 intent to quit.

7 120. Where an employer willfully fails to pay discharged or quitting employees all wages 8 due as required under the California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202, the employer is liable to such 9 employees under California Labor Code § 203 for waiting time penalties in the amount of one (1) 10 day's compensation at the employees' regular rate of pay for each day the wages are withheld, up to 11 thirty (30) days.

12 During all relevant times, Defendants C&W and C&W Western knowingly and 121. 13 willfully violated California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 by failing to pay Plaintiff Dixon and 14 California Class Members who are no longer employed by Defendants C&W or C&W Western all 15 wages owed as alleged herein. Defendants C&W and C&W Western are therefore liable to Plaintiff 16 Dixon and California Class Members who are no longer employed by Defendants C&W and C&W 17 Western for waiting time penalties as required by California Labor Code § 203.

18 122. Plaintiff Dixon, on behalf of herself and similarly situated California Class Members, 19 also requests further relief as described below.

20

#### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

21 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of the California Class Members and 22 Collective Action Members, respectfully requests this Court to grant relief against Defendants C&W, 23 C&W Western, and C&W DC as follows:

24 A. Certify this action as a class action pursuant to Rule 23 for the California Class 25 Members, and appoint Plaintiff Dixon as Class Representative, and her attorneys as Class Counsel 26 against Defendants C&W and C&W Western;

27 Β. Designate this action as a collective action on behalf of the Collective Action Members and authorize issuance of notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) to all members of the Dixon Collective 28

# Case 3:18-cv-05813-JSC Document 113 Filed 07/01/21 Page 25 of 48

1	and Seltz Collective, apprising them of the pendency of this action and permitting them to timely assert		
2	FLSA claims in this action by filing individual consents to opt into this proceeding;		
3	C.	Direct class notice to all California Class Action Members;	
4	D.	Declare that Defendants C&W and C&W Western misclassified all California Class	
5	Members und	ler the California Labor Code as exempt from overtime wages;	
6	E.	Declare that Defendants C&W, C&W Western, and C&W DC misclassified all	
7	members of the	he Dixon Collective and Seltz Collective, under the FLSA as exempt from overtime	
8	wages;		
9	F.	Award unpaid wages, including all overtime compensation and meal and rest period	
10	premiums, du	e under California law and the FLSA, to Plaintiff, Class Members, and Collective Action	
11	Members;		
12	G.	Award damages for Defendants C&W and C&W Western's failure to provide accurate	
13	3 itemized wage statements;		
14	H.	Award statutory penalties for Defendants C&W and C&W Western's failure to pay	
15	Plaintiff Dixon and Class Members all wages due upon termination.		
16	I.	Award damages and restitution for Defendants C&W and C&W Western's failure to	
17	reimburse neo	cessary business expenses;	
18	J.	Award civil penalties under California Labor Code § 2698 et seq. for violations of	
19	Labor Code §	§ 203, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, and 2802, as well as Wage Order 4;	
20	К.	Award liquidated damages to Plaintiffs and Collective Action Members as a result of	
21	C&W, C&W	Western, and C&W DC's willful failure to pay for all wages due as well as overtime	
22	compensation	n pursuant to the FLSA;	
23	L.	Award pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;	
24	М.	Enjoin Defendants C&W and C&W Western from violating California law;	
25	N.	Award costs and expenses of this action;	
26	О.	Award reasonable attorneys' fees; and	
27	Р.	Award such other relief as this Court deems just and proper.	
28			
		23	
	829636.11	SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT - CASE NO. 3:18-CV-05813-JSC	

	Case 3:18-cv-05813-JSC D	ocument 113 Filed 07/01/21 Page 26 of 48
1		JRY TRIAL DEMANDED
2	Plaintiffs demand a trial by jur	y on each and every cause of action so triable.
3	Dated: July 1, 2021	Respectfully submitted,
4		GOLDSTEIN, BORGEN, DARDARIAN & HO
5		7. 15
6		Laura L. Ho
7		Attorneys for Plaintiff
8		
9 10		
10		
11		
12		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	829636.11 SECOND AMENI	24 DED COMPLAINT - CASE NO. 3:18-CV-05813-JSC

Case 3:18-cv-05813-JSC Document 113 Filed 07/01/21 Page 27 of 48

# Exhibit 1



Shareholders Linda M. Dardarian Laura L. Ho

Goldstein, Borgen, Dardarian & Ho Of Counsel Barry Goldstein David Borgen Morris J. Baller

June 4, 2018

#### Private Attorneys General Act - Online Filing

Attn: PAGA Administrator

Re: Labor Code Private Attorney General Notice Act

To Whom It May Concern:

This firm represents the aggrieved employee Dimitri Dixon, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, who work or worked for Cushman & Wakefield Western, Inc., and/or its corporate affiliates (hereinafter and collectively, "C&W" or "Cushman & Wakefield"), as Appraisers. In that position, employees are tasked with, inter alia, appraising the value of real estate investments made by the firm across a range of assets, researching sales, listing, and rentals for properties, constructing financial models, researching property financial information, preparing appraisals for firm clients, and inspecting property. Ms. Dixon has been employed by C&W as an Appraiser since September 2007.

C&W has violated several California Labor Code provisions ("Labor Code") in its employment of Ms. Dixon and similarly situated Appraisers and is therefore liable for civil penalties under Labor Code § 2698 *et seq*. We request that your agency investigate the claims alleged below against C&W. This letter is to provide notice of claims for penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act, as amended, Labor Code § 2699.3 ("PAGA") for violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 (meal and rest periods), 510 (overtime), 512 (meal and rest periods), 558 (penalties and wages for failure to pay all overtime wages and failure to provide either meal periods or premium pay), 226 (wage statements), 1174 (employee payroll records), 2751 (form of commission contracts), as well as California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders 4-2001, Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 8, § 11070 ("Wage Order"). Therefore, the aggrieved employees hereby invite the Labor and Workforce Development Agency to take any action it deems appropriate.

#### **C&W Misclassifies Appraisers as Exempt**

Cushman & Wakefield, a global real estate services firm, classifies its Appraisers as exempt from overtime when those Appraisers should be classified as non-exempt. The firm assigns Appraisers to assess the value of individual properties or a portfolio of assets for clients. Appraisers in California perform the same functions as similarly situated employees nationally. These duties include researching comparable sales, listings, and rental information for properties, constructing discounted cash flows and other financial models, researching benchmark rates of return for various properties, assisting in the preparation of appraisals that will support client decision making, as well as inspecting the property and interviewing market stakeholders with

Tel 510. 763. 9800

Fax 510. 835. 1417

www.gbdhlegal.com

712061.1

June 4, 2018

Senior Appraisers. Appraisers do not sell anything. Appraisers can work remotely, as Ms. Dixon did on several occasions.

Appraisers are compensated by C&W using a recoverable "draw" system. Each employee is required to sign a standard promissory note with C&W indicating that they agree to pay C&W a fixed sum on demand, or immediately at the end of the calendar year, which is equal to the amount they receive as compensation for their labor. Appraisers are then paid a "recoverable draw," periodically against this obligation, which is the sole basis of compensation. Total compensation is derived from the percentage of fees that C&W earns on projects that represents the "valuation [and] advisory assignments" it holds for which employees render services (less broker referral fees, travel costs, supervisory offers, and other miscellaneous costs, all adjusted by employee share if multiple Appraisers work on a project).

While employees are paid a minimum draw – which their employment contract states may not to be reduced "because of the quantity or quality of work" performed – the draw payments made each pay period "are loans to be repaid to C&W upon demand" under the terms of the promissory note. If the Appraiser's share of commissions and fees do not reimburse C&W for the advances, the employees must pay C&W from their own funds. Cushman & Wakefield retain the right, in their sole discretion, to modify the company-wide percentages of fees for certain future assignments by providing 14 days' notice to employees.

Cushman & Wakefield's draw compensation method does not qualify as a salary under the Labor Code. For employee pay to be considered a salary, and the employee exempt from overtime premiums, for example, it must be a fixed rate of pay that is two times the state minimum wage. In addition, unless inconsistent with or less protective than California law, courts generally apply the federal salary basis test which requires monetary payments made in the form of a salary be "free and clear" "meaning '[final] and [unconditional].""

However, the total compensation paid to a C&W Appraiser may in fact be less than two times the state minimum wage if the Appraiser's commissions and fees fall below the amount sufficient to compensate C&W under the promissory note. In addition, because the Appraiser's total compensation is based on the recoverable draw system – and C&W retains the right to both demand full repayment of the total promissory note and/or change how they calculate the percentage of fees for future assignments – an employee is not guaranteed compensation that is both two times the state minimum wage and free and clear of obligations to repay.

And while the terms of the employee's compensation agreement indicate that the employee's wages will not be reduced because of the quantity or quality of their work, such a reduction in pay is possible, given that compensation is tied to the total valuation of assignments to which the employee renders her services. Moreover, such a compensation scheme creates a scenario where the employee's compensation is subject to the availability of work (e.g. sufficient value of C&W's portfolio of assets to appraise), a situation which contrasts with the position of the DLSE that a salaried employee's wages should not be reduced if they are ready, willing, and able to work. Indeed, willful deductions "made in contravention of the salary requirements" nullifies the employee's exempt status.

Further, while Appraisers perform office work for C&W under general supervision in the performance of their duties, these duties are routine production tasks unrelated to the setting or execution of business policy. Appraisers conduct research using multiple methods and resources to find comparable properties and valuations to assess C&W assets, construct financial models, and identify the rates of return for various properties. In addition, appraisers assist clients as they prepare appraisals of various properties and, with Senior Appraisers, inspect properties and interview market stakeholders.

These tasks are unrelated to the setting of general business policy, conducting long or short-term planning, or negotiating property transactions, but are more accurately those duties which contribute to the production of services "that the enterprise exists to produce and market." Appraisers do not supervise other employees. They are not responsible for setting corporate strategy or directing property transactions. Appraisers only conduct site visits or meet with clients or stakeholders in the furtherance of their production-related duties to appraise assets for C&W. These routine and low-level tasks do not establish Appraisers – and specifically Ms. Dixon – as exempt administrative employees.

Therefore, because Appraisers are not compensated with a salary and do not perform administrative duties pursuant to Wage Order 4(1)(A)(2) and relevant federal law, they are not properly classified as exempt employees.

#### Unlawful Failure to Pay All Overtime Wages

Cushman & Wakefield has violated and continues to violate Labor Code §§ 510 and 558 and Wage Order No. 4(2)(K), (3) because it fails to compensate Appraisers for all overtime wages. Appraisers, including Ms. Dixon, work over forty hours a week and/or eight hours a day for C&W.

Although C&W has knowledge that Appraisers work more than forty hours a week and/or eight hours a day, C&W fails to pay them overtime. Unpaid overtime is due at a rate of 1.5 times an Appraisers regular rate of pay for hours over forty in a week, eight hours in a day, or the first eight hours worked on the seventh consecutive workday in a work week, or 2 times an Appraisers regular rate of pay for hours over twelve in a day or those in excess of eight hours in a day on the seventh consecutive workday. The regular rate of pay includes all compensation, such as non-discretionary bonuses.

Because of its failure to pay all overtime wages, C&W has violated Labor Code §§ 510 and Wage Order 4, and is liable for civil penalties and unpaid wages pursuant to Labor Code §§ 558, 1194, and 2698 *et seq*.

#### <u>Unlawful Failure to Provide Meal and Rest Periods or to Provide</u> <u>Pay Premiums for Missed Rest and Meal Periods</u>

Cushman & Wakefield violated and continues to violate Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and Wage Orders No. 4(11)-(12) because it has failed to provide meal and rest periods and to pay premium compensation due its employees for missed meal and rest periods.

Because C&W incorrectly classifies their Appraisers as exempt employees, they did not provide meal periods or rest periods. In addition, C&W is aware that it does not provide meal and rest break periods to Appraisers.

As a result, C&W is liable for civil penalties and wages pursuant to Labor Code §§ 558 and 2698 *et seq.* 

#### **Unlawful Failure to Provide Commission Contracts**

Cushman & Wakefield's method of compensating Appraisers using commissions fails to satisfy Labor Code § 2751 because it does not give employees a signed copy of the commission contract, and does not obtain a signed receipt from each employee.

#### Unlawful Failure to Furnish Compliant Wage Statements

Cushman & Wakefield has violated and continues to violate Labor Code § 226 and Wage Order 4(7) because it willfully fails to furnish wage statements to Appraisers that show all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by employees, and the correct corporate address.

Pay stubs from C&W do not list the actual hours worked; instead spaces on the pay stub where hours and rates would be listed are blank. The pay stubs do not reflect the regular rate or the overtime rate. In addition, on information and belief, the pay stubs provided to Ms. Dixon and similarly situated employees fail to list the correct employer address. While the pay stubs list 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10104, Ms. Dixon's 2018 promissory note lists 18111 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1000, Irvine, CA 92612<sup>1</sup> and C&W's corporate address in California, where Ms. Dixon works, is listed as 425 Market St., Suite 2300 San Francisco, CA 94105. However, neither address is listed on her pay stub.

Because of these violations of Labor Code § 226(a), C&W is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.3 and 2698 *et seq.* 

#### **Unlawful Failure to Maintain Employee Payroll Records**

Cushman & Wakefield has violated Labor Code § 1174 and Wage Order 4(7) because it failed to keep payroll records showing total hours works, inter alia, by not showing overtime hours worked and meal periods taken. Because of these violations of the Wage Orders and Labor Code § 1174, C&W is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1174.5 and 2698 *et seq.* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Ms. Dixon's 2017 promissory note lists 2020 Main St Ste 1000, Irvine, California.

-5-

June 4, 2018

The aggrieved employee on behalf of himself and others similarly situated, hereby invites the Labor and Workforce Development Agency to take any action it deems appropriate.

Sincerely,

m to

Laura L. Ho

LLH/kbm

cc: (via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)
Cushman & Wakefield Western, Inc.
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10104

(via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)C T Corporation System425 Market Street, Suite 2300San Francisco, CA 94105

(via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)Cushman & Wakefield Western, Inc.1 Maritime PlazaSan Francisco, CA 94111-3412

(via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)Cushman & Wakefield Western, Inc.18111 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1000Irvine, CA 92612

#### Case 3:18-cv-05813-JSC Document 113 Filed 07/01/21 Page 33 of 48









First-Class Mail Postage & Fees Paid USPS Permit No. G-10

Sender: Please print your name, address, and ZIP+4<sup>®</sup> in this box\*

Goldstein, Borgen, Dardarlan & Ho - 681 300 Lakeside Drive, Suite 1000 Oakland, CA 94612

First-Class Mail UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE Postage & Fees Paid 市市市 土底美洲 USPS Permit No. G-10 四日 川川 733 ALT PART Sender: Please print your name, address, and ZIP+4<sup>®</sup> in this box Goldstein, Borgen, Dardarlan & Ho - 681 300 Lakeside Drive, Suite 1000 Oakland, CA 94612 2-353650

# Case 3:18-cv-05813

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY
<ul> <li>Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired.</li> <li>Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.</li> <li>Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.</li> </ul>	A. Signature
1. Article Addressed tog Wakefield, Inc. Cushman & Wakefield, Inc. 1811 Von Karman Are., 576.1000	D. Is delivery address different from item 12
Irvine, CA 92612	3. Service Type         A Certified Mail <sup>®</sup> Priority Mail Express™         □ Registered       □ Return Receipt for Merchandise         □ Insured Mail       □ Collect on Delivery         4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)       □ Yes
2. Article Number (Transfer from service label) 7016 2710	
PS Form 3811, July 2013 Domestic Retu	urn Receipt

and the second se	and a first of the second and the second
SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY
<ul> <li>Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired.</li> <li>Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.</li> <li>Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.</li> </ul>	A. Signature
1. Article Addressed to: Cushman Subkitield Western, Inc.	<ul> <li>D. Is delivery address different from item 1? </li> <li>Yes If YES, enter delivery address below: </li> <li>No</li> </ul>
1290 Avenue Athefmericas New York, NY 10/04	<ul> <li>3. Service Type</li> <li>Certified Mail<sup>®</sup> □ Priority Mail Express<sup>™</sup></li> <li>□ Registered □ Return Receipt for Merchandise</li> <li>□ Insured Mail □ Collect on Delivery</li> <li>4. Restricted Delivery? (<i>Extra Fee</i>) □ Yes</li> </ul>
2. Article Number	
(Transfer from service label) 7016 2710	0000 5613 6603
PS Form 3811, July 2013 Domestic Retu	Irn Receipt

ALERT: AS OF APRIL 30, USPS.COM NO LONGER SUPPORTS OUTDATED BROWSERS. TO CO...

# **USPS Tracking**<sup>®</sup>

FAQs > (http://faq.usps.com/?articleId=220900)

#### Track Another Package +

#### Tracking Number: 70162710000056136610

Your item was delivered to the front desk or reception area at 1:07 pm on June 7, 2018 in SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105.

# **⊘** Delivered

June 7, 2018 at 1:07 pm Delivered, Front Desk/Reception SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

Get Updates 🗸

Text & Email Updates	$\checkmark$
Tracking History	$\checkmark$
Product Information	$\checkmark$

See Less ∧

# Can't find what you're looking for?

Go to our FAQs section to find answers to your tracking questions.

Remove X

FAQs (http://faq.usps.com/?articleId=220900)

# The easiest tracking number is the one you don't have to know.

With Informed Delivery<sup>®</sup>, you never have to type in another tracking number. Sign up to:

- See images\* of incoming mail.
- Automatically track the packages you're expecting.
- Set up email and text alerts so you don't need to enter tracking numbers.
- Enter USPS Delivery Instructions<sup>™</sup> for your mail carrier.

## Sign Up

## (https://reg.usps.com/entreg/RegistrationAction\_input?

\*NOTE: Black and white (grayscale) images show the outside, front of letter-sized envelopes and mailpieces that are processed and the state of the s

Case 3:18-cv-05813-JSC Document 113 Filed 07/01/21 Page 38 of 48

# Exhibit 2



Shareholders Linda M. Dardarian Laura L. Ho

Goldstein, Borgen, Dardarian & Ho Of Counsel Barry Goldstein David Borgen Morris J. Baller

August 14, 2018

Private Attorneys General Act - Online Filing

Attn: PAGA Administrator

Re: Labor Code Private Attorney General Notice Act - Additional Violations

To Whom It May Concern:

This firm represents the aggrieved employee Dimitri Dixon, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, who work or worked for Cushman and Wakefield Western, Inc., and/or its corporate affiliates (hereinafter and collectively, "C&W"), as Appraisers.<sup>1</sup>

We have filed a notice to the Labor Workforce Development Agency on June 4, 2018 (LWDA Case Number LWDA-CM-543235-18) alleging several violations of the California Labor Code, including §§ 226.7 (meal and rest periods), 510 (overtime), 512 (meal and rest periods), 558 (penalties and wages for failure to pay all overtime wages and failure to provide either meal periods or premium pay), 226 (wage statements), 1174 (employee payroll records), as well as California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders 4-2001, Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 8, § 11040 ("Wage Order"). The prior letter discussed the factual bases for those violations, which we re-allege and incorporate herein.

Ms. Dixon now writes to add additional violations of the California Labor Code by C&W, specifically Labor Code § 2802 (failure to reimburse business expenses).

## C&W Failed to Reimburse Employees for All Business Expenses

C&W requires Appraisers to purchase cellular phones for work-related usage without reimbursing them for the original cost of the device or the cost of monthly payments to maintain service. Because employers are required to reimburse employees for "all necessary expenditures . . . incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties," C&W has violated and continues to violate California Labor Code § 2802.

Ms. Dixon alleges that in or around 2010 or 2011, she was required to purchase a cell phone for work-related purposes. The regional manager of her office, Ryan McCafferty, expressed frustration that Ms. Dixon did not have a cell phone he could call during work hours when Ms. Dixon was away from the office. Mr. McCafferty expressed this frustration to Ms. Dixon's direct supervisor, Lars Platt, and to other members of Ms. Dixon's office. To remedy this concern, Ms. Dixon purchased a cell phone. Ms. Dixon has used the cell phone to conduct

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Inclusive of those employees who worked as appraisers with titles such as Appraiser, Junior Appraiser, Senior Appraiser, Appraiser Trainee, Associate Director, and Director.

Attn. PAGA Administrator

-2-

August 14, 2018

work-related calls, and has continued to make monthly payments to maintain her cell phone service.

Importantly, an employer is required "to reimburse an employee for the reasonable expense of the mandatory use of a personal cell phone." Cochran v. Schwan's Home Service, Inc., 228 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1144 (2014). Moreover, "to be in compliance with section 2802, the employer must pay some reasonable percentage of the employee's cell phone bill." Id. Therefore, because Ms. Dixon was required to purchase a personal cell phone for work-related purposes, and has never been reimbursed for those expenses, she is entitled to recover a "reasonable percentage" of the phone bill under § 2802.

Ms. Dixon and the aggrieved employees hereby invite the Labor and Workforce Development Agency to take any action it deems appropriate.

Very truly yours,

Jon As

Laura L. Ho

LLH/A

cc: (via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested) Cushman & Wakefield Western, Inc. 1290 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10104

> (via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested) C T Corporation System 425 Market St., Suite 2300 San Francisco, CA 94105

> (via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested) Cushman & Wakefield Western, Inc. 18111 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1000 Irvine, CA 92612





Case 3:18-cv-05813-JSC Document 113 Filed 07/01/21 Page 42 of 48

# Exhibit 3

0.01 2

Shareholders Linda M. Dardarian Laura L. No James Kan GBDH

Goldstein, Borgen, Dardarian & Ho Of Counsel Barry Goldstein David Borgen Morris J. Baller

August 16, 2019

**Private Attorneys General Act – Online Filing** 

Attn: PAGA Administrator

Re: Labor Code Private Attorney General Notice Act - Additional Violations

To Whom It May Concern:

This firm represents the aggrieved former employee Dimitri Dixon, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, who work or worked for Cushman and Wakefield Western, Inc., and/or its corporate affiliates (hereinafter and collectively, "C&W"), as Appraisers.<sup>1</sup>

We filed a notice to the Labor Workforce Development Agency on June 4, 2018 (LWDA Case Number LWDA-CM-543235-18) alleging several violations of the California Labor Code, including §§ 226.7 (meal and rest periods), 510 (overtime), 512 (meal and rest periods), 558 (penalties and wages for failure to pay all overtime wages and failure to provide either meal periods or premium pay), 226 (wage statements), 1174 (employee payroll records), as well as California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders 4-2001, Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 8, § 11040 ("Wage Order"). We filed a notice to the LWDA on August 14, 2018 to add additional violations of California Labor Code § 2802 (failure to reimburse employees for all business expenses). The prior letters discussed the factual bases for those violations, which we re-allege and incorporate herein.

Ms. Dixon now writes to add additional violations of the California Labor Code by C&W, specifically Labor Code § 203 (failure to pay all wages due upon termination).

#### **C&W Failed to Pay Wages Due Upon Termination**

C & W has violated California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 by willfully failing to pay all compensation due and owing to all former Appraisers at the time their employment was terminated, including failure to pay overtime wages.

Pursuant to §§ 203 and 256 of the Labor Code, Plaintiff and similarly situated individuals are now also entitled to recover up to thirty days of wages due to Defendant's "willful" failure to comply with the statutory requirements of sections 201 and 202. Additionally, because C&W

····

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Inclusive of those employees who worked as appraisers with titles such as Appraiser, Junior Appraiser, Senior Appraiser, Appraiser Trainee, Associate Director, and Director.

PAGA Administrator

August 16, 2019

violated California Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203, C&W is liable for civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 203, 256, and 2698 et seq.

Ms. Dixon alleges that on April 15, 2019, she was notified of her termination from C&W, effective December 10, 2018. C&W failed to pay Ms. Dixon all of her wages due upon her termination. Additionally, after Ms. Dixon's employment ended, C&W demanded repayment of her draw amounts, a total of \$15,632.54. Therefore, Ms. Dixon is entitled to recover up to thirty days of wages and additional civil penalties.

Ms. Dixon and the aggrieved employees hereby invite the Labor and Workforce Development Agency to take any action it deems appropriate.

Sincerely,

Laura L. Ho

LLH/kbm

cc: (via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested) Cushman & Wakefield Western, Inc. 1290 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10104

> (via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested) C T Corporation System 425 Market Street, Suite 2300 San Francisco, CA 94105

> (via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested) Cushman & Wakefield Western, Inc. 18111 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1000 Irvine, CA 92612









#### Case 3:18-cv-05813-JSC Document 113 Filed 07/01/21 Page 46 of 48

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY A. Signature Complete items 1, 2, and 3. **ORATION SYSTEM** Print your name and address on the reverse Agent X818 West Seventh so that we can return the card to you. Addressee B. Received by (Printed Name) Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, C. Date of Delivery or on the front if space permits. os Angeles, CA 9001 1. Article Addressed to: D. Is delivery address different from item 1? □ Yes CT corporation system 818 West Swenth Street If YES, enter delivery address below: D No suite 930 Los Angeles, CA 90017 3. Service Type Priority Mail Express® Adult Signature Promy wan Expresse
 Registered Mail™
 Registered Mail™
 Registered Mail™
 Retricted
 Delivery
 Return Receipt for
 Merchandise
 Signature Confirmation™ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
 Certified Mail®
 Certified Mail Restricted Delivery 9590 9402 4578 8278 3061 09 Collect on Delivery
 Collect on Delivery
 Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
 'nsured Mail 2. Article Number (Transfer from service label) Signature Confirmation 7016 2710 0000 9295 7149 sured Mail Restricted Delivery **Restricted Delivery** PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053 **Domestic Return Receipt** OF THE RETURN ADDRESS, FOLD AT DOTTED LINE SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY Complete items 1, 2, and 3. A. Signature Print your name and address on the reverse Agent so that we can return the card to you. □ Addressee Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, B. Received by (Printed Name) C. Date of Delivery or on the front if space permits. 1. Article Addressed to: D. Is delivery address different from item 1? □ Yes Cushman & Wakefield Western, Inc If YES, enter delivery address below: D No 1290 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10104 Service Type 3. Priority Mail Express® Adult Signature □ Registered Mail™ Adult Signature Adult Signature Restricted Delivery Certified Mail@
 Certified Mail Restricted Delivery Collect on Delivery
 Collect on Delivery Registered Mail Restricted Delivery 9590 9402 4578 8278 3060 86 Return Receipt for Merchandise 2. Article Number (Transfer from service label) Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery □ Signature Confirmation™ □ Signature Confirmation Insured Mail 2016 2710 0000 9295 7118 sured Mail Restricted Delivery ver \$500) **Restricted Delivery** PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053 **Domestic Return Receipt** 

#### Case 3:18-cv-05813-JSC Document 113 Filed 07/01/21 Page 47 of 48

E STICKER AT TOP OF EAVELOPE TO THE BIGHT SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY A. Signature Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Print your name and address on the reverse Agent X Addressee so that we can return the card to you. B. Received by (Printed Name) C. Date of Delivery Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, Alyssa Lopez or on the front if space permits. 1. Article Addressed to: D. Is delivery address different from item 1? Yes Cushman & Wakefield Western, Inc. 18/11 Von Korman Avenue, Suite 1000 If YES, enter delivery address below: D No Irvine, CA 92612 3. Service Type Adult Signature Adult Signature Restricted Delivery Priority Mail Express® □ Registered Mail™ Registered Mail<sup>™</sup>
 Registered Mail Restricted
 Delivery
 Return Receipt for
 Merchandise
 Signature Confirmation<sup>™</sup>
 Signature Confirmation Certified Mail® 9590 9402 4578 8278 3060 31 Collect on Delivery Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery 2. Article Number (Transfer from service label) 7016 2710 0000 9295 7132 nsured Mail Restricted Delivery over \$500) **Restricted Delivery** PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053 **Domestic Return Receipt** 

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY	
<ul> <li>Complete items 1, 2, and 3.</li> <li>Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.</li> <li>Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.</li> </ul>	A. Signature X B. Received by <i>(Printed Name)</i>	C. Date of Delivery
1. Article Addressed to: C T Corporation System 425 Market Street, Suite 2300 Jan Francisco, CA 94105	<ul> <li>D. Is delivery address different from item 1? </li> <li>Pes</li> <li>If YES, enter delivery address below: </li> <li>No</li> </ul>	
9590 9402 4578 8278 3060 48 2. Article Number (Transfer from service label) 7016 2710 0000 9295 7125	3. Service Type Adult Signature Adult Signature Restricted Delivery Certified Mail® Certified Mail® Collect on Delivery Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery ured Mail ured Mail Restricted Delivery er \$500)	Priority Mail Express®     Registered Mail™     Registered Mail™     Restricted     Delivery     Return Receipt for     Merchandise     Signature Confirmation™     Signature Confirmation     Restricted Delivery
PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053		omestic Return Receipt

1

