

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Document Scanning Lead Sheet

Jul-27-2016 12:03 pm

Case Number: CGC-16-553270

Filing Date: Jul-27-2016 11:59

Filed by: MADONNA CARANTO

Image: 05489872

COMPLAINT

ISABELLE FAITHHAUER VS. SCULLY HELMETS, INC. ET AL

001C05489872

Instructions:

Please place this sheet on top of the document to be scanned.

		CM-010		
Daniel Feder, SBN 130867	number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY		
The Law Office of Daniel Fe	dor			
332 Pine Street, Suite 700	ner	FILED		
332 Fine Screet, Saite 700				
San Francisco, CA 94104		Superior Court of California County of San Francisco		
TELEPHONE NO.: 415-391-9476	FAX NO.: 415-391-9432			
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Isabelle Faitha		JUL 2 7 2016		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Sa				
STREET ADDRESS: 400 McAllister S	treet	CLERK OF THE COURT		
MAILING ADDRESS:		BY: WOON AND		
CITY AND ZIP CODE: San Francisco, C	A 94104	Deputy Clerk		
BRANCH NAME:		Deputy Cierk		
CASE NAME: Faithauer v. Skull	ly, et al			
CIVIL CASE COVED SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER:		
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET X Unlimited Limited	Counter Joinder	CGC-16-553270		
(Amount (Amount				
demanded demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defenda (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)			
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)		DEPT:		
	low must be completed (see instructions	on page 2).		
1. Check one box below for the case type that				
Auto Tort	Contract	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation		
Auto (22)	Breach of contract/warranty (06)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403)		
Uninsured motorist (46)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)		
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Other collections (09)	Construction defect (10)		
(Insurance coverage (18)	Mass tort (40)		
Asbestos (04)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)		
Product liability (24)	Real Property	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)		
Medical malpractice (45)	Eminent domain/Inverse	Insurance coverage claims arising from the		
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	condemnation (14)	above listed provisionally complex case		
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	types (41)		
Business tort/unfair business practice (07)	Other real property (26)	Enforcement of Judgment		
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)		
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint		
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)			
1		RICO (27)		
Intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38)	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)		
Professional negligence (25)	Judicial Review	Miscellaneous Civil Petition		
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)		
Employment	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)		
X Wrongful termination (36)	Writ of mandate (02)			
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)			
2. This case is x is not compl	ex under rule 3.400 of the California Rule	es of Court. If the case is complex, mark the		
factors requiring exceptional judicial manag	ement:			
a. Large number of separately repres				
b. Extensive motion practice raising of		th related actions pending in one or more courts		
issues that will be time-consuming		s, states, or countries, or in a federal court		
c. Substantial amount of documentar		tjudgment judicial supervision		
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a.	x monetary b. l nonmonetary; de	claratory or injunctive relief c. X punitive		
4. Number of causes of action (specify): 12				
	s action suit.			
		BY FAX		
6. If there are any known related cases, file an	u serve a notice of related case. (You ma	ay use form CWI-U(3.)		
Date: July 26, 2016 Daniel Feder, SBN 130867	MANIO	Jedy lank		
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(Sign	ATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)		
	NOTICE			
Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the fire		(except small claims cases or cases filed		
under the Probate Code, Family Code, or We	elfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules	of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result		
in sanctions.				
 File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule. If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all 				
 If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et so other parties to the action or proceeding. 	eq. or the California Rules of Court, you r	nust serve a copy of this cover sheet on all		
 Unless this is a collections case under rule 3 	3.740 or a complex case, this cover shee	t will be used for statistical nurnoses only		
The state of the s	The state of the control of the cont	Page 1 of 2		

INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must complete and file, along with your first paper, the Civil Case Cover Sheet contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the primary cause of action. To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court.

To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the Civil Case Cover Sheet to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that the case is complex. **CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES**

Auto Tort

Auto (22)—Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the case involves an uninsured motorist claim subject to arbitration, check this item instead of Auto)

Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/ Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort

Asbestos (04)

Asbestos Property Damage Asbestos Personal Injury/ Wrongful Death

Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental) (24)

Medical Malpractice (45)

Medical Malpractice-

Physicians & Surgeons

Other Professional Health Care Malpractice

Other PI/PD/WD (23)

Premises Liability (e.g., slip

and fall)

Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD (e.g., assault, vandalism)

Intentional Infliction of

Emotional Distress Negligent Infliction of

Emotional Distress Other PI/PD/WD

Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort

Business Tort/Unfair Business

Practice (07)

Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination,

false arrest) (not civil

harassment) (08)

Defamation (e.g., slander, libel)

(13)

Fraud (16)

Intellectual Property (19)

Professional Negligence (25)

Legal Malpractice

Other Professional Malpractice

(not medical or legal)

Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35)

Employment

Wrongful Termination (36)

Other Employment (15)

Contract

Breach of Contract/Warranty (06)

Breach of Rental/Lease

Contract (not unlawful detainer

or wrongful eviction) Contract/Warranty Breach-Seller

Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence)

Negligent Breach of Contract/ Warranty

Other Breach of Contract/Warranty

Collections (e.g., money owed, open

book accounts) (09)

Collection Case—Seller Plaintiff

Other Promissory Note/Collections Case

Insurance Coverage (not provisionally

complex) (18)

Auto Subrogation Other Coverage

Other Contract (37)

Contractual Fraud

Other Contract Dispute

Real Property

Eminent Domain/Inverse

Condemnation (14)

Wrongful Eviction (33)

Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26)
Writ of Possession of Real Property

Mortgage Foreclosure

Quiet Title

Other Real Property (not eminent

domain, landlord/tenant, or

foreclosure)

Unlawful Detainer

Commercial (31)

Residential (32)

Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal drugs, check this item; otherwise.

report as Commercial or Residential)

Judicial Review

Asset Forfeiture (05)

Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11)

Writ of Mandate (02)

Writ-Administrative Mandamus

Writ-Mandamus on Limited Court

Case Matter

Writ-Other Limited Court Case

Review

Other Judicial Review (39)

Review of Health Officer Order Notice of Appeal-Labor

Commissioner Appeals

Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court Rules 3.400-3.403)

Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)

Construction Defect (10)

Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)

Securities Litigation (28)

Environmental/Toxic Tort (30)

Insurance Coverage Claims

(arising from provisionally complex

case type listed above) (41)

Enforcement of Judgment

Enforcement of Judgment (20)

Abstract of Judgment (Out of

County)

Confession of Judgment (non-

domestic relations)

Sister State Judgment

Administrative Agency Award

(not unpaid taxes)

Petition/Certification of Entry of

Judgment on Unpaid Taxes

Other Enforcement of Judgment

Case

Miscellaneous Civil Complaint

RICO (27)

Other Complaint (not specified

above) (42)

Declaratory Relief Only

Injunctive Relief Only (non-

harassment).

Mechanics Lien

Other Commercial Complaint

Case (non-tort/non-complex)

Other Civil Complaint

(non-tort/non-complex)

Miscellaneous Civil Petition

Partnership and Corporate

Governance (21)

Other Petition (not specified

above) (43)

Civil Harassment

Workplace Violence Elder/Dependent Adult

Abuse

Election Contest

Petition for Name Change

Petition for Relief from Late

Claim

Other Civil Petition

SUM-100

SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: SKULLY HELMETS, INC.; SKULLY, (AVISO AL DEMANDADO): INC.; MARCUS WELLER; MITCHELL

and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

FOR COURT USE ONLY (SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: ISABELLE FAITHHAUER, an (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): individual

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. ¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y dirección de la corte es):

San Francisco County Superior Court

400 McAllister Street

San Francisco, CA 94104

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:

(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es): 415-391-9476 415-391-9432

Daniel Feder, SBN 130867 The Law Office of Daniel Feder

332 Pine Street, Suite 700 San Francisco, CA 94104

DATE: (Fecha) JUL 27 2016 CLERK OF THE COURT Clerk, by (Secretario)

aa aa indicidual dafaadaaa

(Adjunto)

Page 1 of 1

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)

(Para prueba de entrega de esta citatión use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)). MADONNA CARANTO NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

	ISEARUR	T OF CALL	
/4		大学	
14	San Contract of the Contract o		
.\₫	S COMPANY	8	
Ν	E CO	100 5	
	VII.	TO TO	
	,,,	OF SAN	

2.		s an individual defendant. s the person sued under the fictitious name of (s)	pecify):
3.	o	n behalf of (specify):	
	under:	CCP 416.10 (corporation)	CCP 416.60 (minor)
		CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation)	CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
		CCP 416.40 (association or partnership)	CCP 416.90 (authorized person)
		other (specify):	
4.	b'	y personal delivery on (date):	Page

1 Daniel Feder (SBN 130867) Superior Court of California County of San Francisco LAW OFFICES OF DANIEL FEDER 2 332 Pine Street, Suite 700 JUL 27 2016 San Francisco, CA 94104 3 Telephone: (415) 391-9476 CLERK OF THE CQURT Facsimile: (415) 391-9432 4 Attorneys for Plaintiff, 5 Isabelle Faithauer 6 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 7 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 8 [UNLIMITED JURISDICTION] BY FAX 9 10 Case No.: **CGC-16-553270** ISABELLE FAITHHAUER, an individual, 11 Plaintiff, **COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES** 12 ٧. 1. Violation of CFRA 13 SKULLY HELMETS, INC.; SKULLY, 2. Wrongful Termination in Violation of INC.: MARCUS WELLER; MITCHELL **Public Policy** 14 WELLER; and DOES 1 through 50, 3. Wrongful Termination in Violation of inclusive, **Public Policy** 15 4. Defamation Defendants. 5. Defamation per se 16 6. Intentional Interference with Contractual Relations 7. Intentional Interference with Prospective 17 **Economic Advantage** 8. Injunctive Relief 18 9. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages 10. Failure to Pay All wages upon Separation 19 11. Failure to Provide Meal and Rest Period and wages 20 12. Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements 21 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 22 Plaintiff Isabelle Faithauer (hereafter "Plaintiff" or "Faithauer") complains as follows: 23 Plaintiff is an individual over the age of 18 and is a resident of the State of 1. 24 California.

25

.

- Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant SKULLY
 HELMETS, INC. is a Delaware Corporation with its principal place of business in San
 Francisco, California...
- Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant SKULLY
 INC. is a Delaware Corporation with its principal place of business in San Francisco,
 California.
- 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant SKULLY INC. uses the dba SKULLY HELMETS, INC. and SKULLY HELMETS, INC. uses the dba SKULLY INC. Defendants SKULLY HELMETS, INC. and SKULLY HELMETS, INC. are hereafter collectively referred to as "SKULLY."
- 5. Marcus Weller is an individual who resides in San Francisco, California, and is one of the founders of SKULLY. At all times relating to Plaintiff's employment, Marcus Weller was an officer and director of SKULLY.
- 6. Mitchell Weller is an individual who resides in San Francisco, California, and is one of the founders of SKULLY. During Plaintiff's employment, Mitchell Weller was an office and/or director of SKULLY. Marcus Weller and Mitchell Weller are collectively referred to herein as "The Wellers."
- 7. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise of DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff. Plaintiff therefore sues such defendants by such fictitious names and will amend this complaint to insert their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each such fictitiously named defendant is in some manner, means or degree, connected with the matters alleged and is liable to Plaintiff thereon.
- 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein mentioned each of the defendants was the agent and/or employee of each of the remaining

3

10 11

9

14 15

12

13

16 17

18 19

21 22

20

23 24

25

defendants and, in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting within the course and scope of such agency and/or employment.

- 9. The Wellers used the corporate entities of SKULLY in such a fraudulent manner as to render the corporate entity a sham. The various "corporations" have common management and pay practices, share labor and materials including a distribution and billing system, and operate a common marketing system. As to the various corporations and noncorporations, there exists a unity of interests and ownership that the separate personalities of the individual Defendants and the Corporate Defendants no longer exist. The Wellers intermingled personal funds with corporate funds and used the corporation as a tool to pay their personal expenses. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that the various corporations were never fully organized or perfected, and they are undercapitalized and/or a mere "shell." Plaintiff is further informed and believes that the Defendants failed to observe corporate formalities including maintaining minutes and failure to contribute sufficient capital and Defendants and individual Defendants share common funds. Based on this, an inequity would result if the corporations were not viewed as alter egos of each other and the individual Defendants, including the inability on the part of the corporate entities to satisfy a potential judgment in this case which seeks wages and derivative penalties. Further, the individual Defendants are liable as they engaged in tortuous acts outside of the agency relationship they had with the various corporations under which authority they were acting.
- 10. In or about May, 2014, Plaintiff began working for Defendants as an assistant responsible for working with Marcus Weller and Mitchell Weller to perform tasks essential the management of SKULLY. Among other responsibilities, Plaintiff was assigned responsibility for managing the books of SKULLY, at the direction and under the supervision of the Wellers. These bookkeeping responsibilities included entering records of income and expenses into the accounts payable and accounts receivable ledges of SKULLY. It also

included managing payroll, writing checks on the company's operating account, and using the company's credit cards for various business purposes related to the operation of SKULLY. of the Wellers, who wears multiple hats for defendants. Plaintiff was hired by Marcus Weller and Mitchell Weller.

- 11. Plaintiff consistently worked more than 50 hours each week. However, she was not paid overtime. On several occasions, Plaintiff complained to the Wellers that she was not being properly compensated for working overtime hours and, further, that she was not permitted to take her meal and rest breaks in accordance with California law. The Wellers ignored her complaints.
- 12. During her employment, the Weller's routinely demanded that Plaintiff engage in fraudulent bookkeeping practices designed to defraud investors in SKULLY into believing that SKULLY funds were being used for business purposes, when in fact, the funds were used to pay the personal living expenses of the Wellers. The Wellers used SKULLY corporate accounts as their personal "piggy banks," and demanded that Plaintiff conceal the true nature of the expenses by entering them in SKULLY'S books to make it appear that the expenses were incurred for legitimate business expenses, which in fact they were clearly not. The following are examples of just some of the fraudulent bookkeeping entries that Plaintiff was required to generate, over her strong objections, in order to keep her job: For example:
- a. Rent for personal apartment of Marcus Weller and Mitchell Weller in San Francisco Marina district was written off to the accountants as corporate housing.
- b. Security deposits for apartment in Dogpatch used by the Wellers was paid by SKULLY.
- c. Moving expenses and painting expenses for the Weller's move from the Marina to Dogpatch were paid by SKULLY.
 - d. Weekly apartment cleaning for Marcus Weller and Mitchell Weller.

- e. Personal grocery bills of Marcus Weller and Mitchell Weller expensed to SKULLY through SKULLY's AMEX card.
- f. All restaurant meals of Marcus Weller and Mitchell Weller expensed to SKULLY through SKULLY's AMEX card.
- g. Personal technologies, such as Apple Iphone, iPad, mini-iPad, TV, watch GoPro were all ordered by Marcus Weller via SKULLY's AMEX card.
- h. A payout of \$80,000 to a former co-founder of SKULLY was made and not properly recorded on the company books. Mitchell Weller asked Plaintiff to cover up this transaction, and to conceal it from the accountants of SKULLY, by recording the expense as a reimbursement for expenses during a trip to China.
- i. SKULLY would often grant gifts valuing in excess of \$500 without declaring them to reporter Kym McNicholas for features of SKULLY in her social media, and Collette Davis for being in the SKULLY hero video.
- k. In January, 2015, Marcus Weller attended a Mai Tai and Extreme tech Challenge at a cost of approximately \$13,000 in Las Vegas for three days.
- During January, 2015, Marcus Weller took a non-business related trip to Southern California, where he rented a Lamborghini for the week-end, and expensed it to SKULLY.
- m. In March, 2015, Marcus Weller received a traffic violation driving his Audi R8, also purchased by SKULLY. Marcus Weller required Plaintiff to take driving school on his behalf. A cost of \$450 to an attorney was expensed to SKULLY because driving school was not through an approved vendor.
- n. Four motorcycles were purchased by SKULLY, two of which were for the Wellers' personal use. Insurance for the motorcycles were also charged to SKULLY.
 - o. Mitchell Weller's original Dodge Viper was purchased by SKULLY and

claimed for insurance following an accident. It was later replaced with a new Viper, also purchased by SKULLY.

- p. A three bedroom apartment on Indiana Street in San Francisco was rented by SKULLY for corporate housing. Wellers' brother, Mike Weller, used the three bedroom apartment for himself for three months at \$6,200 per month were paid for by SKULLY. SKULLY paid over \$15,000 for Mike Weller to move to California with his family, whereas it offered other employees only \$2500.
 - q. After Mike Weller moved out of the three bedroom corporate housing apartment, Marcus Weller and Mitchell Weller moved into that apartment, with new furniture TVs, etc. brought in at SKULLY's cost.
- r. In May, 2015, Marcus Weller began a World Tour whereby some of the charges were brought to Plaintiff's attention by accountants of SKULLY: approx. \$2000 for limos in Florida; approx. \$2000 for strip club De Ja Vu; Marcus Weller stayed in Hawaii in June, 2015, for an extra week after the World Tour, at SKULLY's expense; in Hawaii, Marcus Weller expensed \$2,345 worth of paintings to SKULLY.
- s. In October, 2015, Marcus Weller took a day at Laguna Seca to race with other CEOs in Silicon Valley. Extensive amounts were spent on various items.
- t. In fall, 2015, Marcus Weller and Mitchell Weller booked non-refundable trip to Bermuda. Marcus Weller was not pleased with Bermuda, so he booked on 24 hours notice a flight to Hawaii, first class, at SKULLY's expense.
- 13. In or about July of 2015, Plaintiff notified SKULLY'S accountants and the newly hired fully time bookkeeper of the fraudulent bookkeeping entries made by the Wellers. In response, the Wellers retaliated against Plaintiff by demoting her from the position of a personal assistant for Marcus Weller and Mitchell Weller to office manager.

 The purported reason for the demotion was the claim that Plaintiff revealed salary information

to persons not entitled to receive that information. This claim was false. In fact, the Wellers demoted Plaintiff in part because she refused to participate in the Weller's campaign of entering false and misleading statements in the company's books with respect to the nature of the expenses being incurred by the Wellers. Plaintiff repeatedly told the Wellers that the bookkeeping entries were fraudulent, and that investors were entitled to receive truthful information about the purposes for which the expenses were being incurred.

- 14. In September 2015, SKULLY's accountants and bookkeeper continued their investigation to determine the true nature of the expenses incurred by the Wellers. They questioned Plaintiff more aggressively about personal expenses of Marcus Weller and Mitchell Weller. Plaintiff answered the questions verbally, face to face and provided true and correct information about the actual purposes for the fraudulently recorded expenses incurred by the Wellers.
- 15. In October/November, 2015, SKULLY hired a Vice President of Finance. Plaintiff was being asked more questions about personal expenses of Marcus Weller and Mitchell Weller, paid for by SKULLY. The Wellers were notified of the answers that Plaintiff provided to the Vice President, and others, in response to their skeptical inquiries into the bookkeeping entries made by the Wellers.
- 16. In November of 2015, plaintiff's son was diagnosed with Autism. Plaintiff began bringing her son to work on Fridays, with approval of Mitchell Weller and Marcus Weller. When Marcus Weller brought his puppy to work one Friday, he told plaintiff to put her "dog on a leash so [he] can let his kid run around." Marcus Weller made other comments about Plaintiff's son being "sick." Marcus Weller was unhappy about Plaintiff taking time off to go to doctor appointment for her autistic son.
- 17. Plaintiff took a one week vacation, pre-approved by SKULLY, to Disneyland in December, 2015. Upon her return she was terminated by SKULLY.

18. After her termination, SKULLY offered Plaintiff a severance package, which Plaintiff declined. One of the terms of this severance package was a requirement that Plaintiff not disclose any information pertaining to the Wellers fraudulent use of company funds to any person outside of SKULLY. Plaintiff refused to accept this "hush money.' Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Marcus Weller and/or Mitchell Weller were angry because Plaintiff did not accept SKULLY's severance package.

- 19. A few weeks after being terminated by SKULLY, Plaintiff found a new job. While working at her new job, the Wellers called Plaintiff's new employer and told the new employer that Plaintiff was untrustworthy and dishonest. They told the new employer that Plaintiff had been terminated for disclosing confidential financial information. could not handle confidential information. As a result of the Weller's defamatory comments, Plaintiff was fired from her new job.
- 20. Plaintiff suffered damages in an amount according to proof, including but not limited to lost wages, 2,500 shares in SKULLY, which were voided by SKULLY, severe emotional distress.
- 21. The conduct of SKULLY constitutes malice, oppression or fraud, and justifies an award of punitive damages in an amount according to proof.
- 22. Venue is proper in this Court because the acts and events set forth in this Complaint occurred in whole or in part in the county of San Francisco, California.

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

23. In June, 2015, Plaintiff filed a complaint with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) and received an immediate right-to-sue letter.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION VIOATION OF CALIFORNIA FAMILY RIGHTS ACT (CFRA) (Government Code § 12945.2) AGAINST SKULLY

- 24. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as though fully set forth herein.
- 25. Defendants are an employer which regularly employs more than 50 employees within the United States or its territories.
- 26. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff was eligible for benefits under the California Family Rights Act ("CFRA").
- 27. Defendants approved Plaintiff going to doctor appointments for her son, who has autism.
- 28. Notwithstanding, Defendants terminated Plaintiff's position with SKULLY because she brought her son to doctor appointments, in violation of CFRA.
- 29. As a proximate result of Defendants' wrongful acts, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer substantial monetary losses incurred; and has suffered and continues to suffer emotional distress in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 30. Defendants, and each of them, did the acts alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently and oppressively, with the wrongful intent to injure Plaintiff, from an improper and evil motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. The acts complained of were known to, authorized and ratified by Defendants. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to recover punitive damages from Defendants, and each of them, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as more fully set forth herein.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION WRONGFUL TERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY AGAINST SKULLY

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §1102.5 AGAINST SKULLY

31. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as though fully set forth herein.

- 32. Defendants retaliated against Plaintiff for her opposition to Defendants fraudulent accounting practices, which constituted mail and wire fraud, tax evasion, and violation of applicable securities laws, and of Delaware security law provisions prohibiting to fraudulent activities. Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment because plaintiff answered questions about Marcus Weller and Mitch Weller's personal expenses wrongfully being paid by SKULLY. Defendants' stated reason for the termination, performance, was a pretext for the discriminatory reasons for her termination, which were the actual reasons she was fired.
- 33. As a proximate result of Defendants' wrongful acts, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer substantial monetary losses incurred; and has suffered and continues to suffer extreme emotional distress in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 34. Defendants, and each of them, did the acts alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently and oppressively, with the wrongful intent to injure Plaintiff, from an improper and evil motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. The acts complained of were known to, authorized and ratified by Defendants. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to recover punitive damages from Defendants, and each of them, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as more fully set forth herein.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION DEFAMATION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

- 35. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as though fully set forth herein.
- 36. Defendants contacted Plaintiff's new employer and advised that Plaintiff could not handle confidential information.
 - 37. Defendants knew or understood that this claim was false and defamatory, and

would harm Plaintiff in her occupation.

- 38. As a proximate result of Defendants' wrongful acts, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer substantial monetary losses incurred; and has suffered and continues to suffer extreme emotional distress in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 39. Defendants, and each of them, did the acts alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently and oppressively, with the wrongful intent to injure Plaintiff, from an improper and evil motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. The acts complained of were known to, authorized and ratified by Defendants. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to recover punitive damages from Defendants, and each of them, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as more fully set forth herein.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION DEFAMATION PER SE AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

- 40. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as though fully set forth herein.
- 41. Defendants contacted Plaintiff's new employer and advised that Plaintiff could not handle confidential information.
- 42. Defendants knew or understood that this claim was false and defamatory, and would harm Plaintiff in her occupation.
- 43. As a proximate result of Defendants' wrongful acts, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer substantial monetary losses incurred; and has suffered and continues to suffer extreme emotional distress in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 44. Defendants, and each of them, did the acts alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently and oppressively, with the wrongful intent to injure Plaintiff, from an improper and evil motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. The

acts complained of were known to, authorized and ratified by Defendants. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to recover punitive damages from Defendants, and each of them, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as more fully set forth herein.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION INTENTIONAL INTERFERENCE WITH CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as though fully set forth herein.

- 45. Plaintiff had a contractual relationship with her new employer, which Defendants knew about.
- 46. Defendants interfered with that contractual relationship by contacting Plaintiff's new employer and advising that that Plaintiff could not handle confidential information.
- 47. Defendants intended to disrupt the contract Plaintiff had with her new employer, and knew that the contract would be disrupted or substantially certain the contract would be disrupted as a result of their conduct.
 - 48. Plaintiff was terminated from her new job as a result of Defendants' actions.
- 49. As a proximate result of Defendants' wrongful acts, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer substantial monetary losses incurred; and has suffered and continues to suffer extreme emotional distress in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 50. Defendants, and each of them, did the acts alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently and oppressively, with the wrongful intent to injure Plaintiff, from an improper and evil motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. The acts complained of were known to, authorized and ratified by Defendants. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to recover punitive damages from Defendants, and each of them, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as more fully set forth herein.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION INTENTIONAL INTERFERENCE WITH PROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC ADVANTAGE AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

- 51. 56. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as though fully set forth herein.
- 52. 57. Plaintiff had an economic relationship with her new employer, which would have resulted in future economic benefits to Plaintiff, which Defendants knew about
- 53. 58. Defendants interfered with Plaintiff's economic relationship with her new employer by contacting Plaintiff's new employer and advising that that Plaintiff could not handle confidential information.
- 54. 59. Defendants intended to disrupt the economic relationship Plaintiff had with her new employer, and knew that the economic relationship would be disrupted or substantially certain the contract would be disrupted as a result of their conduct.
- 55. 60. Plaintiff was terminated from her new job as a result of Defendants' actions.
- 56. As a proximate result of Defendants' wrongful acts, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer substantial monetary losses incurred; and has suffered and continues to suffer extreme emotional distress in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 57. Defendants, and each of them, did the acts alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently and oppressively, with the wrongful intent to injure Plaintiff, from an improper and evil motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. The acts complained of were known to, authorized and ratified by Defendants. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to recover punitive damages from Defendants, and each of them, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
 - 58. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as more fully set forth herein.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

59. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as though fully set forth herein.

- 60. Plaintiff has no adequate relief in law for the damage to her reputation in her occupation is continuing at this time, and Plaintiff has no other way of controlling Defendants' conduct to prevent them from contacting her employers in the future and providing false information.
- 61. The court should issue temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction and permanent injunction precluding Defendants from contacting Plaintiff's future employers to discuss Plaintiff.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION Willful Failure to Pay All Wages and Overtime (Cal. Labor Code §§ 204, 510) AGAINST SKULLY

- 62. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as though fully set forth herein.
- 63. During the course of Plaintiff's employment with defendants, Plaintiff worked on average in excess of 50 hours per week.
- 64. Under California law, Defendants are required to pay wages for each hour worked, and overtime wages when non-exempt employees work over eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a week by calculating the hourly rate and then computing the overtime premium amount owed. Plaintiff has worked for Defendants without being paid for all hours worked, regular and overtime. As alleged above, Plaintiff was owed wages for the hours he worked in excess of 8 hours per day, and for overtime premium compensation for those hours, which he was not paid at separation. Further, Plaintiff was owed at least one to two hours per each day of his employment based on Defendants' failure to provide his with meal periods or rest breaks. Defendants did not pay him these wages at termination.
- 65. As a result of Defendants' violation of statutory mandates to pay employees for statutory wage requirements, as more fully set forth above, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount to be determined at trial, but which exceed the minimum jurisdictional thresholds of this Court.
- 66. Plaintiff seeks as damages all wages owed by Defendants. Plaintiff seeks an award of pre-judgment interest on the unpaid wages set forth herein.
 - 67. Plaintiff has incurred, and will continue to incur, attorneys' fees and costs in

the prosecution of this action. Plaintiff seeks attorneys' fees under all applicable provisions of law.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as more fully set forth below.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION Willful Failure to Pay All Wages Upon Separation (Cal. Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203)

- 68. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in this complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 69. California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 require that employers pay all employees all wages immediately upon employer termination or within 72 hours after employee resignation. California Labor Code § 203 provides that in instances that an employer willfully fails to pay all wages owing within the proscribed time limits, the employer must continue to pay the subject employee wages until it wages are paid in full. A worker need not prove malice or intentional conduct in establishing their claim for waiting time penalties, but rather must merely establish that the employer did not do something it was obligated to do.
- 70. Plaintiff was adversely affected by Defendants' policy and practice of failing to pay all wages owed, and whose employment with Defendants has subsequently ended, were not paid all wages owing and as a consequence, are entitled to penalty wages, together with interest thereon, and attorneys' fees and costs.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as more fully set forth below.

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION Failure to Provide Meal and Rest Periods and/or Wages in lieu of (Cal. Labor Code § 226.7)

- 71. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in this complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 72. As detailed more fully above, Defendants were required to provide Plaintiff with meal and rest periods in accordance with Cal. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable wages

orders.

- 73. Defendants failed to do so, and as a consequence, Plaintiff is entitled to recover an amount to be proven at trial, but not less than one additional hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal and/or rest period was not provided, as articulated in Cal. Labor Code § 226.7(b).
- 74. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff with either meal and rest periods or wages in lieu thereof, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial, , but which exceed the minimum jurisdictional thresholds of this Court. As these wages were owing in regular pay periods and were not forthcoming, Plaintiff is entitled to and seek an award of prejudgment interest.
- 75. Plaintiff has incurred, and will continue to incur, attorneys' fees and costs in the prosecution of this action. Plaintiff seeks attorneys' fees and costs under all applicable provisions of law.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as more fully set forth below.

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION Willful Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements and Maintain Accurate Pay Records (Cal. Labor Code § 226(a), (e) & (g))

- 76. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in this complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 77. California Labor Code section 226(a) sets forth numerous "accurate" items which must accompany furnish to employees with their paychecks ("paystubs") and which it must maintain for a period of not less than three years. Included in those items, are numerous items that Defendant did not accurately provide and retain. These items include, but are not limited to: (1) a statement of accurate gross wages earned by Plaintiff; (2) a statement of total hours worked by Plaintiff; (3) a statement of net wages earned; (4) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; (5) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Plaintiff has been damaged by defendants' conduct because

Defendants' have deprived Plaintiff of having accurate records by the minute of the exact number of hours she worked for Defendants, thereby making it impossible for her to calculate the exact amount of wages owed to her for the time she spent working for Defendants.

- 78. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants' failure to provide accurate information in both paystubs and in its records was a result of Defendants own knowing and intentional conduct. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' failure to provide accurate information to Plaintiff about working hours and wages owing, Plaintiff was injured in an amount to be proven at trial, but not less than \$50 for the initial pay period in which these violations occurred and an additional \$100 per pay period thereafter. (See Labor Code § 226(e).)
- 79. Plaintiff is also seeking an injunction against Defendants, pursuant to Cal. Labor Code § 226(g), to prevent them from continuing to violate Section 226(a).
- 80. Plaintiff has incurred, and will continue to incur attorneys' fees and costs in the prosecution of this action. Plaintiff seeks attorneys' fees under all applicable provisions of law.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as more fully set forth below.

THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION Violations of Labor Code Section 98.6

- 80. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as though fully set forth herein.
- 81. Plaintiff's wrongful termination from her employment with Defendants was based upon Defendants' violation of the Public Policy of the State of California as set forth in Labor Code Section 98.6 in that Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment because of her complaints about Defendants' failure to pay her overtime hours. Defendants' stated reason for the termination, performance, was a pretext for the discriminatory reasons for her termination, which were the actual reasons she was fired.
 - 82. As a proximate result of Defendants' wrongful acts, Plaintiff has suffered and

continues to suffer substantial monetary losses incurred; and has suffered and continues to suffer extreme emotional distress in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

83. Defendants, and each of them, did the acts alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently and oppressively, with the wrongful intent to injure Plaintiff, from an improper and evil motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. The acts complained of were known to, authorized and ratified by Defendants. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to recover punitive damages from Defendants, and each of them, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as more fully set forth herein.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff makes the following demand:

- (a) That process be issued and served as provided by law, requiring Defendants, and each of them, to appear and answer or face judgment;
- (b) For general, special, actual, compensatory and/or nominal damages, as against Defendants, and each of them, in an amount to be determined at trial;
- (c) For punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial sufficient to punish, penalize and/or deter Defendants, and each of them, from further engaging in the conduct described herein;
- (d) For back pay and other benefits Plaintiff would have been afforded but-for Defendants', and each of their, unlawful conduct;
 - (e) For injunctive relief as described herein;
 - (f) For statutory penalties as allowed by law;
 - (g) For costs and expenses of this litigation;
 - (h) For reasonable attorneys' fees where appropriate;
- (i) For pre and post-judgment interest on all damages and other relief awarded herein from all entities against whom such relief may be properly awarded; and,
 - (j) For all such other relief as this Court deems just and appropriate.

1	
2	Dated: July 22016 Law Offices of Daniel Feder
3	
4	
5	Daniel Feder Count
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff Isabelle Faithhauer
7	
8	
9	
10	PLAINTIFF DEMANDS TRIAL BY JURY.
11	Dated: July 2016 Law Offices of Daniel Feder
12	Daniel Felle (unt)
13	DANIEL FEDER Attorneys for Plaintiff Isabelle Faithauer
14	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES