ENDORSED FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY

JUL 22 2021

Yosef Peretz (SBN 209288) 1 Shane Howarter (SBN 311970) 2 PERETZ & ASSOCIATES 22 Battery Street, Suite 200 3 San Francisco, CA 94111 Tel: 415.732.3777 4 Fax: 415.732.3791 5 yperetz@peretzlaw.com showarter@peretzlaw.com 6 Martin M. Horowitz (SBN 79073) Stephanie Rubinoff (SBN 98229) 8 HOROWITZ & RUBINOFF 1440 Broadway, Suite 607 9 Oakland, CA 94612 Tel: 510.444.7717 10 mhorowitz@h-rlegal.com 11 srubinoff@h-rlegal.com 12

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
By Deputy

Attorneys for Named Plaintiffs IRENE CLINE, LYNN CHO, DESIREE PACHECO, and ITZEL MARLENE DIAZ

## SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA COUNTY

IRENE CLINE, LYNN CHO, DESIREE PACHECO, and ITZEL MARLENE DIAZ, individually, on behalf of all other similarly situated persons, on behalf of the CALIFORNIA LABOR AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY, and on behalf of the STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SI SE PUEDE BEHAVIORAL, INC. a.k.a. SOCIALLY SIGNIFICANT PROGRAMMING FOR BEHAVIORS, INC., a California corporation; FELICIA LOPEZ, an individual; and DOES 1-20,

Case No. RG18911378

DECLARATION OF ITZEL MARLENE DIAZ IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES TO JUDGE WINIFRED Y. SMITH DEPARTMENT 21

Date: August 13, 2021 Time: 10:00 a.m.

7 11110. 10.00 4.111.

Reservation Nos.: R-2276695

Complaint Filed: July 2, 2018

Trial Date: None set

28

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

2.7

Defendants.

I, Itzel Marlene Diaz, declare as follows:

- 1. I make this declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement. The facts set forth in this declaration I know to be true of my own personal knowledge, except where facts are stated to be based on information and belief, and those facts I believe to be true. If called as a witness I could and would testify competently to the matters set forth in this declaration.
- 2. I worked as an hourly, non-exempt tutor at SSPBI from September 2015 to July 2016.
- 3. Upon my hire, I received a copy of the SSPBI employee handbook stating that tutors are only paid for time spent in sessions with clients.
- 4. Despite spending many hours in any given work week driving in my car for work, I was not compensated for any time spent driving to, from, or between clients' homes for sessions.
- 5. I was only reimbursed for mileage when I voluntarily submitted a form to SSPBI. I believe that I only submitted a reimbursement form once, if at all, because I was too busy with clients during the day. When I was hired, SSPBI did not inform me about getting reimbursed for mileage. I heard about the voluntary forms from a co-worker approximately two months after I joined SSPBI. Despite not having time to fill out the mileage reimbursement forms, and consistently being unable to submit them, no SSPBI manager ever reached out to me about reimbursing my mileage.
- 6. I was often not permitted to take meal or rest breaks, regardless of the number of hours I worked in a day. No SSPBI manager ever told me that I was entitled to meal and rest breaks.
- 7. There were many weeks where I was scheduled for back-to-back sessions every workday. This meant I only had time to rush to my car and immediately drive to the next session, with no time for a break or meal in between. As a result of working back-to-back sessions, I frequently ate lunch in my car, even while driving to my next session, or did not eat lunch at all.
- 8. SSPBI calculated my overtime hours on a weekly basis rather than on a daily basis. As a result, I was not paid for all of the overtime hours I worked. I occasionally worked over eight (8) hours on Saturdays, when I would attend a longer Play/Social Group session in the morning and early afternoon followed by regular sessions at clients' homes.
- 9. As a result of these violations, SSPBI failed to provide me with accurate, itemized wage statements.