1	EDMUND G. BROWN JR. Attorney General of California MARK J. BRECKLER Spring Aggistont Attorney General		
2			
3	Senior Assistant Attorney General JON M. ICHINAGA Supervising Deputy Attorney General MAURICE R. JOURDANE		
4			
5	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 42898		
6	CAROLYN Y. La State Bar No. 162945		
7	300 S. Spring Street Los Angeles, CA 90013		
8			
9	Attorneys for the People of the State of California		
10	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
12		,	
13	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF	Case No.	
14	CALIFORNIA ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Attorney General of the State of California,	COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, RESTITUTION AND	
15	Plaintiff,	PENALTIES	
16 17	v.	VERIFIED ANSWER REQUIRED PURSUANT TO CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 446	
	MODE CAY TEODERICA TRICE - C-US	PROCEDURE SECTION 446	
18 19	MDP CALIFORNIA, INC., a California Corporation, and DAVID JOSEPH WALNUM, and DOES 1 through 100,	·	
20	inclusive,		
21	Defendants.		
22		. <i>'</i>	
23	The People of the State of California, by ar	nd through Edmund G. Brown Jr., Attorney	
24	General of the State of California, allege as follows:		
25	1. Fair competition is fundamental to the free enterprise economic system. To further a		
26	free economic system, Business & Professions Code, section 17200 expressly prohibits unlawful,		
27	unfair or fraudulent business practices. MDP California, Inc. (hereafter MDP) has engaged in and		
- '	The state of the s		

continues to engage in the unlawful business practices enabling it to reduce costs and underbid

28

competition on construction jobs requiring drywall installation. Unless enjoined by the court from continuing these unlawful business practices and ordered to make restitution and pay statutory penalties, it is anticipated that defendants will continue to pursue the unlawful schemes.

- 2. The State of California acts through its duly elected Attorney General, Edmund G. Brown Jr., who is the chief law officer of the State. (Cal. Const., art. 5, § 13.) In this capacity he may seek enforcement of the rights and interests of the people of California. Business and Professions Code section 17204 authorizes the Attorney General to bring actions to enforce the California Unfair Competition Law.
- 3. Defendant MDP is, and at all times relevant herein has been, a corporation doing business in the State of California, including in the county of Los Angeles. Defendant David Joseph Walnum is the CEO and President of MDP California.
- 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each defendant is the alter ego of each other defendant using the corporate form to further the illegal scheme enabling it to engage in the unfair competition complained of herein. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the defendants are integrated enterprises with an interrelation of operations, common management, centralized control of labor relations, and common ownership.
- 5. The true names and capacities of defendants sued in the Complaint under the fictitious names of DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to plaintiff who therefore sues such defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to show the true names of each when the same has been ascertained. Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100 are, and at all relevant times were, engaged with MDP in the activities and conduct complained of herein.
- 6. Whenever reference is made in this complaint to any act of any defendant, such allegations shall mean that the named defendant through its agents, employees, or representatives, performed or authorized such acts while engaged in the management, direction or control of the affairs of all the defendants.
- 7. Any reference to any act of any defendant means that each defendant engaged in the act individually, jointly, and/or in concert with all other defendants.

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

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

## Unfair Competition Business and Professions Code section 17200

- 8. The People are informed and believe that during performance of drywall installation, defendants have obtained an unfair advantage in bidding competition for drywall construction work to the detriment of honest and fair competitors. Defendants' unlawful and unfair business practices include: failure to pay overtime premium pay (Wage Order 16-2001, sub. (3)(A)); paying employees with checks with another's name as the person payable (Labor Code, section 226); failure to pay employees for all hours worked (Wage Order 16-2001, sub. 4(A)); paying employees without providing a written statement of the hours worked, etc. and providing employees with inaccurate paycheck stubs when they were provided (Labor Code, section 226); failure to provide employees with workers compensation coverage when injured and failure to report injuries to employees to its workers compensation carrier (Labor Code, sections 3700, 3760); failure to accurately report to EDD the wages paid all employees and to take deductions from employees' pay for state taxes and disability insurance (Unemployment Insurance Code, sections 1088, 13020, 986); failure to pay unemployment insurance taxes (Unemployment Insurance Code section 976); failure to provide employees with statutorily required rest periods (Labor Code, section 226.7; Wage Order 16-2001, sub. (11)); failure to immediately pay laid-off employees (Labor Code, section 202); and failure to provide all employees with W-2 forms.
- 9. Due to defendants unfair and unlawful practices defendants have obtained an unfair advantage over their competitors and deprived employees the benefits they are entitled to under California law.
- 10. Through MDP's unfair and unlawful practices set forth in paragraph 8, MDP employees during the past statutory period suffered substantial monetary losses and are entitled to restitution for the losses. The losses to defendants' employees include but are not limited to:
- (a). time-and-one-half pay for overtime worked Monday through Saturday and double time for overtime worked on Sunday;
  - (b). one-hour pay for each paid rest period not provided;

28

27

28

Respectfully Submitted, Dated: April 13, 2010 EDMUND G. BROWN JR. Attorney General of California MARK J. BRECKLER Senior Assistant Attorney General JON M. ICHINAGA Supervising Deputy Attorney General MAURICE R. JOURDANE Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for the People of the State of California LA2009603671 70255925.doc 5 .