

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Garcia Garcia v. Anane Enterprise LLC; Amazon Logistics, Inc.;
Amazon.com Services, LLC; Amazon.com Services, Inc.; and Does 1
through 100, inclusive

No. 2:24-cv-01993-TLN-CKD (E.D. Cal. Mar. 21, 2025) · No. 2:24-cv-01993-TLN-CKD · Decided March 24,
2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California considers Amazon Defendants’ motion to dismiss and strike in a putative California wage-and-hour class action. The court denies dismissal based on group pleading, finds the plaintiff sufficiently pleaded alter ego liability and claims for overtime, minimum wages, meal periods, and rest breaks, and grants or denies other portions of the motion as specified in the remainder of the order. The motion to strike is denied as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Troy L. Nunley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	March 24, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-01993-TLN-CKD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) to dismiss a removed California wage-and-hour class action and moved under Rule 12(f) to strike the class allegations.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts factual allegations as true, draws reasonable inferences in the plaintiff’s favor, and determines whether the complaint states a plausible claim for relief under Rules 8(a) and 12(b)(6). Legal conclusions and conclusory allegations are not presumed true. Class allegations may be dismissed at the pleading stage when the complaint lacks factual allegations making the class claims plausible. A Rule 12(f) motion to strike is discretionary and generally disfavored.

TOPICS

wage and hour

motions to dismiss

class actions

civil procedure

employment law

PRACTICE AREAS

employment law

wage and hour

civil procedure

class actions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint impermissibly grouped the defendants together and failed to provide fair notice of the claims.
2. Whether the complaint plausibly alleged joint-employer liability against the Amazon Defendants and Anane.
3. Whether the complaint plausibly alleged alter-ego liability sufficient to permit collective pleading.
4. Whether the overtime and minimum-wage claims satisfied the pleading standard under Landers.
5. Whether the meal-period and rest-break claims plausibly alleged violations without identifying a specific calendar week.
6. Whether the waiting-time penalties claim was adequately pleaded where Plaintiff did not allege that she had been discharged or had quit.
7. Whether the wage-statement claim was adequately pleaded through allegations of underlying wage violations and knowing or intentional conduct.
8. Whether the untimely-payment, vacation-pay, and business-expense claims were adequately pleaded.
9. Whether the UCL claim was barred by the availability of an adequate remedy at law and lacked sufficient allegations of economic injury or standing.
10. Whether the putative class allegations plausibly alleged commonality and a common policy or practice.
11. Whether the class allegations should be stricken under Rule 12(f).

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint's collective references to the defendants did not require dismissal because Plaintiff alleged alter-ego and joint-employer theories under which collective allegations could be appropriate. Although the joint-employer allegations were insufficiently factual, the alter-ego allegations were sufficient at the pleading stage.
2. The complaint did not sufficiently allege joint-employer liability because it failed to provide facts showing how each defendant exercised joint authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's employment or establishing the totality of the working relationship.
3. The complaint sufficiently pleaded alter-ego liability against Anane and the Amazon Defendants.

4. The complaint plausibly alleged overtime and minimum-wage claims and did not need to identify a particular calendar week, exact dates, or mathematically precise unpaid hours.
5. The complaint plausibly alleged meal-period and rest-break violations without identifying a particular calendar week or pleading the hours worked with mathematical precision.
6. The waiting-time penalties claim was inadequately pleaded because Plaintiff did not allege that she had been discharged or had quit; the claim was dismissed with leave to amend.
7. The wage-statement penalties claim was adequately pleaded and survived dismissal.
8. The business-expense reimbursement claim was inadequately pleaded because Plaintiff did not allege facts showing when or how the expenses were incurred, Defendants' knowledge of them, or a willful refusal to reimburse; the claim was dismissed with leave to amend.
9. The untimely-payment claim and the claim for unused and vested vacation wages were dismissed without leave to amend because Plaintiff conceded the dismissal by failing to address the claims in opposition.
10. The UCL claim was dismissed without leave to amend because Plaintiff had an adequate legal remedy for the alleged unpaid wages and failed to allege the required basis for equitable relief; the alleged sick-leave theory also lacked allegations of actual loss of money or property.
11. The complaint did not plausibly allege that all putative class members were subject to the same unlawful policy or suffered the same violations; the class allegations were dismissed with leave to amend.
12. The motion to strike the class allegations was denied as moot and premature, without prejudice to renewal after an operative complaint and discovery.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Landers standard has been applied differently by different district courts in this circuit.” (at 12)

“The Court clarifies now that it also “rejects a hypertechnical reading of Landers that would require plaintiffs to pinpoint specific dates to survive a motion to dismiss.”” (at 14)

“A plaintiff need only allege facts demonstrating that there was at least one workweek in which they worked more than forty hours and were not paid overtime wages.” (at 15)

“The necessary prerequisite for a court to award equitable remedies is the absence of an adequate remedy at law.” (at 22)

“Commonality is generally satisfied where . . . the lawsuit challenges a system-wide practice or policy that affects all of the putative class members.” (at 25)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that she worked for Defendants from approximately June 2022 through the filing of the complaint, performing package-sorting, loading, and delivery work. She alleged that Defendants required her and other non-exempt employees to perform uncompensated pre-shift and post-shift work, work during meal periods, don and doff uniforms or safety equipment, attend meetings, and make work-related calls. She also

alleged failures involving overtime, minimum wages, meal and rest periods, wage statements, waiting-time penalties, business-expense reimbursement, vacation pay, and unfair competition.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a putative class action in San Joaquin County Superior Court alleging California wage-and-hour violations against Anane Enterprise LLC and Amazon-related defendants. Amazon Defendants removed the action to the Eastern District of California and moved to dismiss and strike. The court denied dismissal of the group-pleading theory and Claims One, Two, Three, Four, and Six; dismissed Claims Seven, Nine, and Ten without leave to amend; dismissed Claims Five and Eight with leave to amend; dismissed the class allegations with leave to amend; and denied the motion to strike as moot and premature.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand. Plaintiff may file an amended complaint within thirty days of the electronic filing date of the order. Amazon Defendants must file a responsive pleading within twenty-one days after the amended complaint. If Plaintiff does not amend, the case proceeds on the remaining claims.

CASES CITED

- Navarro v. Block, 250 F.3d 729, 732 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 677-80 (2009)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555, 570 (2007)
- Cruz v. Beto, 405 U.S. 319, 322 (1972)
- Retail Clerks International Ass'n v. Schermerhorn, 373 U.S. 746, 753 n.6 (1963)
- United States ex rel. Chunie v. Ringrose, 788 F.2d 638, 643 n.2 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Adams v. Johnson, 355 F.3d 1179, 1183 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Mir v. Little Co. of Mary Hospital, 844 F.2d 646, 649 (9th Cir. 1988)
- Isuzu Motors Ltd. v. Consumers Union of U.S., Inc., 12 F. Supp. 2d 1035, 1042 (C.D. Cal. 1998)
- Khoja v. Orexigen Therapeutics, Inc., 899 F.3d 988, 998 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc)
- Doe v. United States, 58 F.3d 494, 497 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Gardner v. Martino, 563 F.3d 981, 990 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Ecological Rights Foundation v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 713 F.3d 502, 520 (9th Cir. 2013)
- McHenry v. Renne, 84 F.3d 1172, 1180 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Dawson v. One Call Medical, Inc., 2021 WL 5513516, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 21, 2021)
- United States ex rel. Ginger v. Ensign Group, Inc., 2022 WL 4110166, at *3-*4 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2022)
- Martinez v. Combs, 49 Cal. 4th 35, 52, 64 (2010)

- Terrell v. Samuel, Son & Co. (USA), Inc., 2020 WL 5372107, at *2-*3 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 23, 2020)
- Hibbs-Rines v. Seagate Technologies, LLC, 2009 WL 513496, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 2, 2009)
- Myles v. Builders Concrete, Inc., 2022 WL 2318176, at *3-*5 (E.D. Cal. June 28, 2022)
- Ming-Hsiang Kao v. Holiday, 58 Cal. App. 5th 199, 205-06 (2020)
- Daewoo Electronics America Inc. v. Opta Corp., 2013 WL 3877596, at *5 (N.D. Cal. July 25, 2013)
- Parker v. Country Oaks Partners, LLC, 2023 WL 3149330, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 22, 2023)
- Landers v. Quality Communications, Inc., 771 F.3d 638, 645-46 (9th Cir. 2014), as amended (Jan. 26, 2015)
- Turner v. LTF Club Management Co., LLC, 2022 WL 1018498, at *2-*3 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 5, 2022)
- Boon v. Canon Business Solutions, Inc., 592 F. App'x 631, 632 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Varsam v. Laboratory Corp. of America, 120 F. Supp. 3d 1173, 1178 (S.D. Cal. 2015)
- Tan v. Grubhub, Inc., 171 F. Supp. 3d 998, 1008 (N.D. Cal. 2016)
- Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court, 53 Cal. 4th 1004, 1034, 1040-41 (2012)
- Boyack v. Regis Corp., 812 F. App'x 428, 430 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Carceioly v. Khalaf, 2012 WL 832616, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 12, 2012)
- Porch v. Masterfoods USA, Inc., 685 F. Supp. 2d 1058, 1075 (C.D. Cal. 2010), aff'd, 364 F. App'x 365 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Willner v. Manpower Inc., 35 F. Supp. 3d 1116, 1127-30 (N.D. Cal. 2014)
- Derik Duley v. Centerra Group, LLC, 2020 WL 6526369, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2020)
- Meraz-Valencia v. Westlake Royal Roofing, LLC, 2023 WL 2541852, at *5 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 16, 2023)
- Hansber v. Ulta Beauty Cosmetics, LLC, 2021 WL 4553649, at *7 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 5, 2021)
- Nelson v. Dollar Tree Stores, Inc., 2011 WL 3568498, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2011)
- Taylor v. Western Marine Products, Inc., 2014 WL 1779279, at *5-*6 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 2014)
- Arroyo v. International Paper Co., 611 F. Supp. 3d 824, 845 (N.D. Cal. 2020)
- Krauss v. Wal-Mart, Inc., 2019 WL 6170770, at *5 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2019)
- Korea Supply Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp., 29 Cal. 4th 1134, 1143 (2003)
- Roper v. Big Heart Pet Brands, Inc., 510 F. Supp. 3d 903, 921 (E.D. Cal. 2020)
- Shelton v. Ocwen Loan Servicing, 2019 WL 4747669, at *10 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 30, 2019)
- Alvarez v. Chevron Corp., 656 F.3d 925, 933 n.8 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Barranco v. 3D Systems Corp., 952 F.3d 112, 1129 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Dairy Queen, Inc. v. Wood, 369 U.S. 469, 478 (1962)
- Thompson v. Fastaff, LLC, 2022 WL 4109450, at *8 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2022)
- Fanckowiak v. Scenario Cockram USA, Inc., 2020 WL 9071697, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 30, 2020)
- Sonner v. Premier Nutrition Corp., 971 F.3d 834, 844 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Guzman v. Polaris Industries Inc., 49 F.4th 1308, 1312 (9th Cir. 2022)
- O'Shea v. Littleton, 414 U.S. 488, 496 (1974)
- Armstrong v. Davis, 275 F.3d 849, 861 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes, 564 U.S. 338, 350 (2011)

- Wise v. Ulta Salon, Cosmetics & Fragrance, Inc., 2019 WL 3943859, at *4 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2019)
- Jue v. Costco Wholesale Corp., 2010 WL 889284, at *6 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 11, 2010)
- Mish v. TForce Freight, Inc., 2021 WL 4592124, at *8 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 6, 2021)
- Yursik v. Inland Crop Dusters Inc., 2011 WL 5592888, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 15, 2011)
- Whittlestone, Inc. v. Handi-Craft Co., 618 F.3d 970, 973-74 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Sidney-Vinstein v. A.H. Robins Co., 697 F.2d 880, 885 (9th Cir. 1983)
- Neilson v. Union Bank of Cal., N.A., 290 F. Supp. 2d 1101, 1152 (C.D. Cal. 2003)
- Parducci v. Overland Solutions, Inc., 399 F. Supp. 3d 969, 986 (N.D. Cal. 2019)
- Khorrami v. Lexmark International Inc., 2007 WL 8031909, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 13, 2007)
- Cholakyan v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC, 796 F. Supp. 2d 1220, 1245 (C.D. Cal. 2011)
- Ardente, Inc. v. Shanley, 2010 WL 546485, at *6 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 10, 2010)
- Rutman Wine Co. v. E. & J. Gallo Winery, 829 F.2d 729, 738 (9th Cir. 1987)