

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Webb v. Rejoice Delivers LLC

No. 22-cv-07221-BLF (N.D. Cal. Aug. 7, 2025) · No. 22-cv-07221-BLF · Decided August 7, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California partially grants and partially denies defendants’ Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss Ian Webb’s fourth amended complaint alleging California wage-and-hour violations. The court dismisses all claims against Amazon Logistics, Inc. and Amazon.com Services, LLC for insufficiently differentiated joint-employer allegations, permits portions of the overtime and minimum-wage claims against Rejoice Delivers LLC to proceed, and dismisses the expense-reimbursement claim without leave to amend. The court also dismisses the class allegations with leave to amend to narrow the proposed class to qualifying delivery drivers.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Beth Labson Freeman
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	August 7, 2025
DOCKET	22-cv-07221-BLF
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants Amazon Logistics, Inc. and Amazon.com Services, LLC moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) to dismiss the fourth amended complaint, and Rejoice Delivers LLC joined the motion. The court granted the motion in part, denied it in part, and granted leave to amend only the class allegations.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Rule 12(b)(6), dismissal is appropriate when the complaint fails to state a cognizable legal theory or fails to allege sufficient facts to support a claim. The court accepts factual allegations as true and construes them in the plaintiff’s favor, but the complaint must contain sufficient factual matter to state a plausible claim. Class allegations may be dismissed at the pleading stage when the complaint lacks factual allegations and reasonable inferences establishing their plausibility.

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

wage and hour

class actions

civil procedure

remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

employment law

wage and hour

class actions

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Webb plausibly alleged that Amazon Logistics and Amazon.com were his joint employers under California law.
2. Whether Webb adequately pleaded overtime and minimum-wage claims against Rejoice.
3. Whether Webb adequately pleaded claims for meal- and rest-period violations, waiting-time penalties, and inaccurate wage statements against Rejoice.
4. Whether Webb adequately pleaded a claim for reimbursement of business expenses.
5. Whether Webb plausibly alleged class claims covering all hourly-paid, non-exempt Rejoice employees rather than only delivery drivers.
6. Whether leave to amend should be granted for the dismissed claims and class allegations.

HOLDINGS

1. Webb failed to plausibly allege that Amazon Logistics or Amazon.com was his joint employer because the complaint failed to differentiate the two entities and did not allege that either exercised sufficient control over his wages, hours, or working conditions.
2. Webb adequately pleaded an overtime claim by alleging that he worked more than eight hours in a day and/or more than forty hours in a week during his approximately four-week employment and was not paid overtime, but the claim was dismissed without leave to amend to the extent it relied on allegedly unpaid non-discretionary bonuses, incentives, or shift differentials.
3. Webb adequately pleaded a minimum-wage claim based on uncompensated work performed while he was clocked out during meal periods, but the claim was dismissed without leave to amend to the extent it relied on allegedly unpaid non-discretionary bonuses, incentives, or shift differentials.
4. Webb adequately pleaded claims for failure to provide meal and rest periods.
5. Webb adequately pleaded derivative claims for waiting-time penalties and inaccurate wage statements because his underlying overtime and minimum-wage claims survived in substantial part.
6. Webb failed to state a reimbursement claim because he alleged only generally that class members incurred personal-cell-phone expenses and were not reimbursed, without identifying a specific instance in which he incurred an expense and Rejoice failed to reimburse him.

7. The class allegations were inadequately pleaded because the proposed class covered all hourly-paid, non-exempt Rejoice employees, while Webb alleged facts only concerning delivery drivers.
8. Leave to amend was denied for the claims against Amazon Logistics and Amazon.com, the specified bonus-related portions of Claims 1 and 4, and Claim 7, but granted for the class allegations.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Dismissal of a complaint is appropriate under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) “if the complaint fails to state a cognizable legal theory or fails to provide sufficient facts to support a claim.””

“The gist of Webb’s allegations is that when Amazon Logistics and Amazon.com used drivers employed by Rejoice, Amazon Logistics and Amazon.com required the drivers to wear an Amazon uniform and drive an Amazon van, use the Amazon Flex app, and deliver a certain number of packages per day.”

“The Court finds these allegations to be sufficient to state claims for failure to provide meal and rest breaks.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Webb worked for approximately four weeks as a delivery driver employed and paid by Rejoice Delivers LLC, which dispatched him to Amazon facilities to pick up and deliver packages. He alleged that Amazon Logistics and Amazon.com jointly employed him because they supplied branded vans and uniforms, controlled aspects of delivery routes and package quotas, maintained time records through the Amazon Flex app, and scheduled meal periods. Webb alleged that delivery quotas, reprimands for returning with packages, and calls from dispatch caused him to work through meal and rest periods while clocked out, and that he was not paid all overtime or other compensation and was not reimbursed for personal cell-phone expenses.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Webb filed a putative class action alleging California wage-and-hour violations against his alleged employer, Rejoice Delivers LLC, and against Amazon Logistics and Amazon.com as alleged joint employers. After prior amended pleadings and prior orders directing Webb to cure deficiencies, the defendants moved to dismiss the fourth amended complaint. The court dismissed all claims against the Amazon defendants without leave to amend, partially dismissed aspects of the overtime and minimum-wage claims against Rejoice without leave to amend, dismissed the business-expense claim without leave to amend, denied dismissal of the remaining individual claims against Rejoice, and dismissed the class allegations with leave to amend.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand. Webb was ordered to file a fifth amended complaint within 14 days, by August 21, 2025. Amendment was limited to narrowing the class allegations; he could not add new claims or parties without express leave.

CASES CITED

- *Sinclair v. City of Seattle*, 61 F.4th 674, 678 (9th Cir. 2023)
- *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- *Mish v. TForce Freight, Inc.*, No. 21-CV-04094-EMC, 2021 WL 4592124, at *8-9 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 6, 2021)
- *Martinez v. Combs*, 49 Cal. 4th 35, 64 (2010)
- *Terrell v. Samuel, Son & Co. (USA)*, No. EDCV 20-587 JGB (KKx), 2020 WL 5372107, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 23, 2020)
- *Landers v. Quality Communications, Inc.*, 771 F.3d 638, 644-45 (9th Cir. 2014), as amended (Jan. 26, 2015)
- *Boon v. Canon Business Solutions, Inc.*, 592 F. App'x 631, 632 (9th Cir. 2015)
- *Bush v. Vaco Technology Services, LLC*, No. 17-CV-05605-BLF, 2018 WL 2047807, at *5 (N.D. Cal. May 2, 2018)
- *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal. 4th 1004, 1040-41 (2012)
- *Varsam v. Laboratory Corp. of America*, 120 F. Supp. 3d 1173, 1178-79 (S.D. Cal. 2015)
- *Naranjo v. Spectrum Security Services, Inc.*, 13 Cal. 5th 93, 105 (2022)
- *Ramirez v. HV Global Management Corp.*, No. 21-CV-09955-BLF, 2022 WL 2132916, at *5 (N.D. Cal. June 14, 2022)
- *Stuart v. RadioShack Corp.*, 641 F. Supp. 2d 901, 904 (N.D. Cal. 2009)
- *Johnson v. Air Products & Chemicals, Inc.*, No. 2:22-CV-07327-JLS-PD, 2023 WL 2663279, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 26, 2023)
- *Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2003)
- *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962)