

1 Jahan Sagafi (Cal. Bar No. 224887)  
 2 Relic Sun (Cal. Bar No. 306701)  
 3 Molly Frandsen (Cal. Bar No. 320094)  
 4 **OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP**  
 5 One California Street, 12th Floor  
 6 San Francisco, CA 94111  
 7 Telephone: (415) 638-8800  
 8 Facsimile: (415) 638-8810  
 9 E-Mail: jsagafi@outtengolden.com  
 10 E-Mail: rsun@outtengolden.com  
 11 E-Mail: mfrandsen@outtengolden.com

12 Steven M. Tindall (Cal. Bar No. 187862)  
 13 Aaron Blumenthal (Cal. Bar No. 310605)  
 14 Nikul Shah (Cal. Bar No. 321282)  
 15 **GIBBS LAW GROUP LLP**  
 16 505 14th Street, Suite 1110  
 17 Oakland, CA 94612  
 18 Telephone: 510-350-9700  
 19 Fascimile: 510-350-9701  
 20 E-Mail: smt@classlawgroup.com  
 21 E-Mail: ab@classlawgroup.com  
 22 E-Mail: ns@classlawgroup.com

23 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65  
 66  
 67  
 68  
 69  
 70  
 71  
 72  
 73  
 74  
 75  
 76  
 77  
 78  
 79  
 80  
 81  
 82  
 83  
 84  
 85  
 86  
 87  
 88  
 89  
 90  
 91  
 92  
 93  
 94  
 95  
 96  
 97  
 98  
 99  
 100  
 101  
 102  
 103  
 104  
 105  
 106  
 107  
 108  
 109  
 110  
 111  
 112  
 113  
 114  
 115  
 116  
 117  
 118  
 119  
 120  
 121  
 122  
 123  
 124  
 125  
 126  
 127  
 128  
 129  
 130  
 131  
 132  
 133  
 134  
 135  
 136  
 137  
 138  
 139  
 140  
 141  
 142  
 143  
 144  
 145  
 146  
 147  
 148  
 149  
 150  
 151  
 152  
 153  
 154  
 155  
 156  
 157  
 158  
 159  
 160  
 161  
 162  
 163  
 164  
 165  
 166  
 167  
 168  
 169  
 170  
 171  
 172  
 173  
 174  
 175  
 176  
 177  
 178  
 179  
 180  
 181  
 182  
 183  
 184  
 185  
 186  
 187  
 188  
 189  
 190  
 191  
 192  
 193  
 194  
 195  
 196  
 197  
 198  
 199  
 200  
 201  
 202  
 203  
 204  
 205  
 206  
 207  
 208  
 209  
 210  
 211  
 212  
 213  
 214  
 215  
 216  
 217  
 218  
 219  
 220  
 221  
 222  
 223  
 224  
 225  
 226  
 227  
 228  
 229  
 230  
 231  
 232  
 233  
 234  
 235  
 236  
 237  
 238  
 239  
 240  
 241  
 242  
 243  
 244  
 245  
 246  
 247  
 248  
 249  
 250  
 251  
 252  
 253  
 254  
 255  
 256  
 257  
 258  
 259  
 260  
 261  
 262  
 263  
 264  
 265  
 266  
 267  
 268  
 269  
 270  
 271  
 272  
 273  
 274  
 275  
 276  
 277  
 278  
 279  
 280  
 281  
 282  
 283  
 284  
 285  
 286  
 287  
 288  
 289  
 290  
 291  
 292  
 293  
 294  
 295  
 296  
 297  
 298  
 299  
 300  
 301  
 302  
 303  
 304  
 305  
 306  
 307  
 308  
 309  
 310  
 311  
 312  
 313  
 314  
 315  
 316  
 317  
 318  
 319  
 320  
 321  
 322  
 323  
 324  
 325  
 326  
 327  
 328  
 329  
 330  
 331  
 332  
 333  
 334  
 335  
 336  
 337  
 338  
 339  
 340  
 341  
 342  
 343  
 344  
 345  
 346  
 347  
 348  
 349  
 350  
 351  
 352  
 353  
 354  
 355  
 356  
 357  
 358  
 359  
 360  
 361  
 362  
 363  
 364  
 365  
 366  
 367  
 368  
 369  
 370  
 371  
 372  
 373  
 374  
 375  
 376  
 377  
 378  
 379  
 380  
 381  
 382  
 383  
 384  
 385  
 386  
 387  
 388  
 389  
 390  
 391  
 392  
 393  
 394  
 395  
 396  
 397  
 398  
 399  
 400  
 401  
 402  
 403  
 404  
 405  
 406  
 407  
 408  
 409  
 410  
 411  
 412  
 413  
 414  
 415  
 416  
 417  
 418  
 419  
 420  
 421  
 422  
 423  
 424  
 425  
 426  
 427  
 428  
 429  
 430  
 431  
 432  
 433  
 434  
 435  
 436  
 437  
 438  
 439  
 440  
 441  
 442  
 443  
 444  
 445  
 446  
 447  
 448  
 449  
 450  
 451  
 452  
 453  
 454  
 455  
 456  
 457  
 458  
 459  
 460  
 461  
 462  
 463  
 464  
 465  
 466  
 467  
 468  
 469  
 470  
 471  
 472  
 473  
 474  
 475  
 476  
 477  
 478  
 479  
 480  
 481  
 482  
 483  
 484  
 485  
 486  
 487  
 488  
 489  
 490  
 491  
 492  
 493  
 494  
 495  
 496  
 497  
 498  
 499  
 500

Clifford Linn, Baxter Gipson, John Gregorio,  
 Plaintiffs,  
 v.  
 DoorDash, Inc.,  
 Defendant.

Case No. 20-cv-00666  
**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**  
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

DoorDash Class Action Lawsuit

**INTRODUCTION**

1  
2 1. Defendant DoorDash, Inc., has misclassified most of its workforce as “independent  
3 contractors.”

4 2. The “basic objective” of employment laws is to ensure that workers with “less  
5 bargaining power than a hiring business” are not forced to “accept work for substandard wages”  
6 in order to survive. *Dynamex Operations West, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 4 Cal.5th 903, 956-57  
7 (2018). Minimum wage laws, for example, are designed to ensure workers the “minimal wages”  
8 that enable them to “obtain a subsistence standard of living.” *Id.* Similarly, overtime protections  
9 exist to provide an incentive for employers to cap the workweek at 40 hours per week, both to  
10 spread employment and to ensure that workers’ health and welfare do not suffer from overlong  
11 work schedules.

12 3. Even though federal, California, Illinois, and Massachusetts law require DoorDash  
13 drivers to be classified as “employees” and receive the rights and protections employees get,  
14 DoorDash continues to willfully misclassify them as independent contractors, to reap the benefit  
15 of their work and maximize its profit.

16 4. DoorDash’s misclassification of its workforce causes many harms to Plaintiffs and  
17 their fellow “Dashers” (the term DoorDash uses for its delivery drivers). This misclassification  
18 depresses Dashers’ wages, forcing many to work multiple jobs to make ends meet. Almost 80%  
19 of Americans now live paycheck to paycheck, a trend that UC Berkeley economist Robert Reich  
20 blames on “[t]he rise of ‘independent contractors,’” which he calls “the most significant legal  
21 trend in the American workforce – contributing directly to low pay, irregular hours, and job  
22 insecurity.”

23 5. As “employees,” Plaintiffs are entitled to all the benefits and protections afforded by  
24 federal and state labor law—including minimum wage and reimbursement of business expenses.

25 6. Plaintiffs now bring this action, on behalf of themselves and their fellow Dashers, to  
26 recover from DoorDash what they are rightfully owed as “employees.”

27 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

28 7. This Court has jurisdiction over the causes of action asserted herein under 28 U.S.C. §

1 1332(d)(2) because this is a class action wherein the amount in controversy exceeds the sum or  
2 value of \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs; there are more than 100 members in the  
3 proposed class; and at least one member of the class of Plaintiffs is a citizen of a state different  
4 from the Defendant. The Court also has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) because a Plaintiff  
5 is a citizen of a different state from the Defendant and the amount in controversy exceeds the  
6 value of \$75,000. Additionally, the Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this  
7 civil action asserts claims under federal law for violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

8 8. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant DoorDash, Inc, because it is  
9 headquartered in California, does business in California, and transactions or events giving rise to  
10 claims herein occurred in California.

11 9. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) because a substantial part  
12 of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in, were directed to, and/or emanated  
13 from this District.

14 **INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

15 10. Pursuant to N.D. Cal. Local Rules 3-2(c) and (d), intradistrict assignment to the San  
16 Francisco/Oakland Division is proper because DoorDash’s principal place of business is in San  
17 Francisco, California, and a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiffs’  
18 claims occurred there.

19 **PARTIES**

20 **I. Plaintiffs**

21 11. Plaintiff Clifford Linn is a resident and citizen of California. He resides in Santa  
22 Maria, California.

23 12. Since April 2019, he has worked as a delivery driver for DoorDash in California.

24 13. As permitted by his contract with DoorDash, he notified DoorDash by mail on  
25 November 12, 2019, December 20, 2019, and January 6, 2020, that he was opting out of  
26 DoorDash’s arbitration clause.

27 14. Plaintiff Baxter Gipson is a resident and citizen of Illinois. He resides in Bensenville,  
28 Illinois.

1 15. Since August 2017, he has worked as a delivery driver for DoorDash in Illinois.

2 16. As permitted by his contract with DoorDash, he notified DoorDash by mail on  
3 November 22, 2019, December 10, 2019, and January 6, 2020, that he was opting out of  
4 DoorDash's arbitration clause.

5 17. Plaintiff John Gregorio is a resident and citizen of Massachusetts. He resides in New  
6 Bedford, Massachusetts.

7 18. Since September 2018, he has worked as a delivery driver for DoorDash in  
8 Massachusetts.

9 19. As permitted by his contract with DoorDash, he notified DoorDash by mail on  
10 December 9, 2019, December 10, 2019, and January 6, 2020, that he was opting out of  
11 DoorDash's arbitration clause.

12 20. Contemporaneously with the filing of this complaint, Plaintiff John Gregorio filed a  
13 complaint with the Massachusetts Attorney General's office concerning the violations of  
14 Massachusetts law alleged herein.

15 **II. Defendant**

16 21. DoorDash, Inc., is incorporated under Delaware law and is headquartered at 901  
17 Market St. Ste 600, San Francisco, CA 94103.

18  
19 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

20 **I. DoorDash's Business Uses Dashers to Deliver Food.**

21 22. DoorDash provides its customers with an on-demand food delivery service through  
22 its mobile phone application (the "DoorDash App"). Customers can use the DoorDash App to  
23 order food from various restaurants.

24 23. To deliver this food to its customers, DoorDash maintains a workforce of over  
25 300,000 delivery drivers.

26 24. Applicants for a delivery driver position at DoorDash must pass a background and  
27 vehicle check. If approved, drivers must download DoorDash's companion application for its  
28 delivery drivers, the "Dasher App." DoorDash uses the term "Dasher" to refer to its drivers.

1 25. Through the Dasher App, DoorDash assign orders to its drivers.

2 26. When they are ready to begin their shift, drivers must click a button in the Dasher  
3 App indicating that they are ready to deliver orders.

4 27. When filling a typical order, drivers must drive to the assigned restaurant; find a  
5 parking spot; notify DoorDash that they have arrived; pick up the food if it's ready or wait to  
6 pick it up until the restaurant finishes preparing it; pay for the food using a special credit card  
7 provided by DoorDash (the "Red Card"); notify DoorDash that they have picked up the food;  
8 drive to the customer's location; find a parking spot; follow any specific delivery instructions  
9 provided by DoorDash; deliver the food to the customer; and notify DoorDash that the food has  
10 been delivered.

11 28. Drivers who fail to follow DoorDash's precise instructions can be terminated.

12 **II. DoorDash Uses "Metrics" to Control How Drivers Perform the Work.**

13 29. DoorDash measures drivers on four "metrics": (1) "On Time" Deliveries – that is, the  
14 percentage of orders that were delivered on or before the delivery time provided to the customer;  
15 (2) Average Customer Rating – a rating of the Dasher's performance from 1 to 5 stars, which  
16 customers fill out after receiving their orders, (3) Completion Rate – percentage of orders that  
17 were successfully delivered; and (4) Acceptance Rate – percentage of order opportunities that the  
18 Dasher accepts.

19 30. Dashers often worry about their metrics, because low metrics can harm their  
20 opportunities to earn money and can be grounds for termination

21 31. Dashers with low metrics are terminated. For example, DoorDash bans drivers from  
22 the Dasher App if the driver's Average Customer Rating falls below 4.2 stars.

23 32. These star ratings are used primarily for punishment. Customers cannot use the  
24 ratings to select which driver they want.

25 33. The metrics also affect the quality of assignments that Dashers are eligible to receive.  
26 For example, Dashers with low metrics are generally not eligible to receive "Drive" orders,  
27 which typically consist of large catering orders or grocery deliveries.  
28

1 **III. DoorDash Imposes Strict Delivery Requirements on Drivers.**

2 34. DoorDash drivers must deliver the food on a tight delivery schedule or face  
3 consequences.

4 35. For each delivery, DoorDash provides the customer with the exact time that the  
5 Dasher is expected to arrive at the restaurant and the exact time the Dasher should arrive at the  
6 customer's location. DoorDash also provides the customer with a map showing the Dasher's  
7 precise location at every moment.

8 36. When a Dasher falls even slightly behind schedule, they not only hurt their "On  
9 Time" Delivery statistics, but they also risk receiving a bad customer rating. Customers will  
10 often leave a 1-star rating if an order is late, even if the tardiness is not the driver's fault.  
11 Customers generally cannot distinguish between delays caused by the driver, the restaurant, or  
12 DoorDash itself.

13 37. Dashers can hurt their "metrics" not only by delivering too slowly, but also by trying  
14 to accept only plum assignments.

15 38. When DoorDash assigns an order to a Dasher, the Dasher has a brief period during  
16 which they can decline the order. DoorDash provides Dashers with an estimate of the amount of  
17 money they can receive and the driving distance.

18 39. Dashers who try to accept only high-paying or low-distance orders face termination.  
19 According to DoorDash's "Deactivation Policy," drivers with an "extremely low" Acceptance  
20 Rate may be terminated (without defining "extremely low").

21 40. DoorDash also makes drivers ineligible for incentive pay if their Acceptance Rate is  
22 too low. For example, Dashers cannot receive "Peak Pay" (a bonus for delivering orders during  
23 periods of high demand) if they maintain too low an Acceptance Rate.

24 **IV. DoorDash Keeps Tips Left for Drivers**

25 41. Under the compensation system in place before August 2019, DoorDash typically  
26 used tips that customers left for drivers to pay its own costs, rather than to increase driver's total  
27 compensation.

28 42. When DoorDash offered an order to a driver, the Dasher App would display a

1 guaranteed minimum amount that the driver would earn if they accepted the order. DoorDash  
2 guaranteed to pay this amount from its own coffers.

3 43. Unbeknownst to many drivers, if they later received a tip, the tip would typically not  
4 increase their take-home pay beyond this guaranteed amount. Buried in the “Help” section of its  
5 website, DoorDash explained that drivers were entitled to *either* the guaranteed amount *or* 100%  
6 of their tips (plus \$1 in base pay from DoorDash), but not both. The Dasher would receive  
7 whichever amount was larger.

8 44. Take, for example, an order for which DoorDash guaranteed at least \$5. Whether the  
9 customer left no tip, a \$1 tip, \$2 tip, or \$3 tip, DoorDash would pay the Dasher \$5. In contrast, if  
10 the customer left, for example, a \$7 tip, DoorDash would give the Dasher the full tip (\$7) and  
11 one additional dollar (\$1) of base pay from DoorDash. The Dasher would either be paid based on  
12 tips or based on the guaranteed minimum, but not both.

13 45. In July 2019, faced with a media storm of angry drivers and “upset customers, who  
14 wanted their tips to serve as a bonus for workers rather than subsidizing DoorDash’s operations,”  
15 DoorDash agreed to change its compensation model (starting in August 2019), so that Dashers  
16 always received their tips.<sup>1</sup>

#### 17 **V. DoorDash Drivers Are “Employees”**

18 46. Companies like DoorDash were never supposed to be allowed to run an entire  
19 business on the backs of independent contractors. People who work in the company’s core line of  
20 business are its “employees.” *United States v. Silk*, 331 U.S. 704, 718 (1947).

21 47. DoorDash claims an unprecedented portion of its workforce as “independent  
22 contractors,”<sup>2</sup> and only classifies about 2.5% of its workforce as “employees.” These workers,  
23 many of whom are computer programmers, receive special treatment from DoorDash. But the  
24 delivery drivers, who make up the bulk of DoorDash’s workforce, are denied even the most basic  
25 protections of federal and state labor laws. DoorDash does not pay them minimum wage; it does  
26 not pay overtime; and it does not reimburse business expenses, such as gasoline and car

27 <sup>1</sup> Danielle Abril, *DoorDash’s New Tipping Policy Has Increased Driver Pay*, Fortune (Nov. 12, 2019),  
<https://fortune.com/2019/11/12/doordash-new-tipping-policy-worker-pay/>.

28 <sup>2</sup> Keith Cunningham-Parmeter, *From Amazon to Uber: Defining Employment in the Modern Economy*, 96 B.U. L.  
Rev. 1673, 1683–84 (2016).

1 maintenance. Its classification of its drivers also deprives them of basic protections against  
2 discrimination and sexual harassment.<sup>3</sup>

3 48. By design, “independent contractors” are exempted from “nearly every” labor law,  
4 but this classification was not meant to be a loophole for companies like DoorDash.<sup>4</sup> As an  
5 article in the *Boston University Law Review* explains, “Historically, firms reserved the  
6 independent contractor designation for entrepreneurial individuals whose skills demanded higher  
7 pay in the open market.”<sup>5</sup> With this in mind, “[l]egislatures rationalized excluding [independent  
8 contractors] from most employment laws because these individuals did not require the same  
9 legal protections as potentially more vulnerable, less-skilled ‘employees.’”<sup>6</sup>

10 49. Today, DoorDash preys upon the many of the most vulnerable members of our  
11 society. Some DoorDash drivers earn as little as \$4.50 per hour, after accounting for mileage  
12 costs. These are the precise individuals that legislatures meant to protect with minimum wage  
13 and other workplace protections.

14 50. In recent years, state legislatures have taken action to send a clear message that most  
15 workers should be “employees.”

16 51. California, Illinois, and Massachusetts have all adopted an “ABC test” to determine  
17 whether a company, like DoorDash, has misclassified its workers as “independent contractors.”  
18 Because employee status was meant to be the default, the ABC test “presumptively considers all  
19 workers to be employees and permits workers to be classified as independent contractors only if  
20 the hiring business demonstrates that the worker in question satisfies *each* of three conditions:

- 21 (A) that the worker is free from the control and direction of the hirer in  
22 connection with the performance of the work... *and*  
23 (B) that the worker performs work that is outside the usual course of the  
24 hiring entity’s business; *and*  
25 (C) that the worker is customarily engaged in an independently established  
26 ... business of the same nature as that involved in the work performed.”

---

27 <sup>3</sup> *Id.*

28 <sup>4</sup> *Id.*

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*



1 *Dynamex Operations West, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 4 Cal.5th 903, 956-57 (2018) (emphasis in  
2 original).

3 **A. Dashers Are Not Free from DoorDash’s Control.**

4 52. DoorDash maintains uniform policies and terms of service with which all Dashers  
5 must comply. Failure to comply can result in immediate deactivation from the Dasher App.

6 53. DoorDash assigns orders to its drivers on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Drivers are not  
7 given a list of available orders from which to choose.

8 54. DoorDash unilaterally determines how much to pay Dashers for each delivery.  
9 Dashers have no ability to set their own rates.

10 55. Before they accept an order, Dashers are not told how long they will have to wait at  
11 the restaurant, even though DoorDash has already calculated a “food prep duration” for the order  
12 (based on historical data for that restaurant).<sup>7</sup>

13 56. If a Dasher declines an order, they don’t know if they will receive another. But they  
14 *do* know they will suffer consequences. If a Dasher tries to decline an order, the app says, “Are  
15 you sure you want to decline this order?,” and warns them about the consequences of doing so.

16 57. Dashers who decline orders face the loss of incentive pay and other delivery  
17 opportunities. Dashers who decline too many orders face termination.

18 58. During the course of a delivery, Dashers must follow all instructions in the Dasher  
19 App, including specific instructions for picking up the food, paying for it, and delivering it to the  
20 customer. They have no freedom to deviate.

21 59. DoorDash enforces a strict delivery schedule. Failure to deliver an order by the  
22 specified time will hurt Dashers’ “metrics.”

23 60. DoorDash scrutinizes drivers’ “metrics” and takes away opportunities or terminates  
24 drivers whose “metrics” fall too low.

25 61. DoorDash uses these “metrics” as a means to exert its control over drivers.

26 62. DoorDash has the power to discipline drivers, including by denying them access to  
27

---

28 <sup>7</sup> Raghav Ramesh (Machine Learning Engineer at DoorDash), *How DoorDash Leverages AI in its on-demand Logistics Engine* (May 2018), at 18.

1 certain types of work. And DoorDash has the power to shut down drivers’ access to the Dasher  
2 App for myriad reasons, thus preventing them from obtaining and responding to delivery  
3 requests.

4 **B. Dashers’ Work Is Not Outside DoorDash’s “Usual Course of Business.”**

5 63. DoorDash’s usual course of business is food delivery. DoorDash markets itself as a  
6 food delivery service. DoorDash’s home page is titled “DoorDash Food Delivery,” and its  
7 homepage’s description – which appears in search results – says, “Get breakfast, lunch, dinner  
8 and more delivered from your favorite restaurants right to your doorstep with one easy click.”  
9 DoorDash wants people to think of it as a delivery service.

10 64. Dashers are central to DoorDash’s business. Dashers provide the service that  
11 DoorDash sells to the public. DoorDash earns money by providing its customers with food  
12 delivery – a service that is wholly dependent on Dashers. DoorDash has created a fully  
13 integrated solution through which customers can order directly from the restaurant and have their  
14 order delivered for a specified delivery fee. Customers cannot select their Dasher (for example,  
15 based on their ratings, qualities, experience, or other factors). And Dashers cannot select their  
16 desired customers (for example, based on how much the customer is willing to pay or the  
17 distance to the customer’s location).

18 65. To determine DoorDash’s “usual course of business,” there are no material issues of  
19 fact to be resolved. As a result, Plaintiffs are entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

20 **C. DoorDash Cannot Meet Its Burden to Show that Dashers Are “Customarily**  
21 **Engaged” in a Separate Delivery Business.**

22 66. Dashers lack business autonomy. Dashers are not engaged in an independently  
23 established business. Dashers cannot provide DoorDash delivery services without the DoorDash  
24 App. Dashers are dependent on DoorDash to identify deliveries and customers for them.

25 67. Dashers cannot advertise any product offering to customers or compete for  
26 customers’ business. Customers cannot even select their driver. DoorDash does not, for example,  
27 provide customers with a list of available drivers and allow customers to choose a driver based  
28 on job qualifications, star ratings, delivery speed, or other metrics.

1 68. In fact, DoorDash impedes customers' and drivers' ability to contract directly with  
2 each other. During a delivery, DoorDash obscures the customer's and Dasher's full name and  
3 contact information. A customer cannot place a favored driver on retainer. And Dashers cannot  
4 solicit repeat business from well-paying customers.

5 69. Dashers are not engaged in a specialized delivery trade. Dashers do not need to  
6 possess any particular skills other than those required to obtain a driver's license.

7 70. DoorDash does not verify, when Dashers apply for the job, that they operate a  
8 separate delivery business. Plaintiff does not operate a separate delivery business.

9 71. DoorDash requires Dashers to apply for the job using their name and Social Security  
10 number. There is no option for Dashers to contract with DoorDash via a business entity owned  
11 by the Dasher. Dashers may not hire their own employees to assist them in providing services for  
12 DoorDash.

13 72. By working for DoorDash, Dashers have not independently made the decision to go  
14 into business for themselves. DoorDash has unilaterally dictated that Dashers are independent  
15 contractors while precluding them from taking the usual steps toward promoting and establishing  
16 an independent business, such as forming business relationships with DoorDash customers or  
17 otherwise promoting their services to the public.

18 **VI. Misclassification of DoorDash Drivers Creates Substantial Harm.**

19 73. For the reasons stated above, DoorDash cannot meet its burden to prove that  
20 Plaintiffs and Class members were properly classified as independent contractors, as opposed to  
21 employees.

22 74. Plaintiffs and Class members are – and always have been – entitled to the protections  
23 of federal and their state's labor laws.

24 75. DoorDash's misclassification harms not only its drivers, but also other workers in the  
25 gig economy who are similarly misclassified, workers generally, and the public.

26 76. DoorDash's misclassification harmed Plaintiffs and Class members by depriving  
27 them of the rights, benefits, and protections that they are entitled to as employees of DoorDash.  
28 DoorDash does not pay them the normal amounts payable to employees, such as minimum wage

1 and reimbursements for gas, mileage, insurance, and other necessary costs related to making  
 2 deliveries for DoorDash. Plaintiffs and Class members spend considerable time braving  
 3 dangerous traffic conditions to deliver food to DoorDash customers as quickly as possible,  
 4 delivery after delivery, day after day. This is highly lucrative work for DoorDash but perilous  
 5 for Dashers. A substantial percentage of delivery personnel have been physically injured on the  
 6 job, and at least four have been killed performing delivery work for DoorDash and similar  
 7 companies. DoorDash’s misclassification of Plaintiffs and Class members deprives them of any  
 8 right to workers compensation insurance and paid sick or disability leave to recover from and  
 9 provide compensation for the injuries that Plaintiff risks by performing this work for DoorDash.  
 10 DoorDash’s misclassification decision harms other Dashers in the same way.

11 77. Furthermore, DoorDash’s misclassification of Dashers harms other workers in similar  
 12 positions, such as drivers, cyclists, and deliverers who are misclassified as independent  
 13 contractors by other delivery and rideshare companies, because it shapes the labor market, drives  
 14 down wages and undermines workers’ ability to make use of the important protections of federal  
 15 and their state’s labor laws.

16 78. DoorDash’s misclassification also harms competitors that *do* play by the rules.  
 17 “Employers who misclassify their workers avoid many of the costs of employment and thereby  
 18 gain an unfair market advantage over their law-abiding competitors.”<sup>8</sup> For example, San  
 19 Francisco’s Yellow, which hired drivers as “employees,” went bankrupt in 2016, facing unfair  
 20 competition from Uber and Lyft.

### 21 COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

22 79. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein all of the allegations contained  
 23 above.

24 80. Plaintiffs bring claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), 29 U.S.C. §§ 201  
 25 *et seq.*, on behalf of the following “Collective”:

26 All individuals who – while working for DoorDash – performed one or more  
 27 deliveries during the Collective Liability Period and who subject to DoorDash’s

28 <sup>8</sup> Christopher Buscaglia, *Crafting a Legislative Solution to the Economic Harm of Employee Misclassification*, 9 U.C. Davis Bus. L.J. 111, 112 (2009).

arbitration clause.

1  
2 81. The Collective Liability Period covers three years before the filing of this action to  
3 the date of judgment.

4 82. Excluded from the Collective is Defendant, any entity in which Defendant has a  
5 controlling interest, and Defendant's officers, directors, legal representatives, successors,  
6 subsidiaries, and assigns. Also excluded from the Class is any judge, justice, or judicial officer  
7 presiding over this matter and the members of their immediate families and judicial staff.

8 83. Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend the definition of the Collective if discovery and  
9 further investigation reveal that the Collective should be expanded, subdivided, or modified in  
10 any other way.

11 84. DoorDash is liable under FLSA for several violations, including failing to properly  
12 compensate Plaintiffs and the Collective. The FLSA claims in this lawsuit should be adjudicated  
13 as a collective action. Upon information and belief, there are many similarly situated DoorDash  
14 drivers who have been underpaid in violation of the FLSA who would benefit from the issuance  
15 of a court-supervised notice of the present lawsuit and the opportunity to join it. Those similarly  
16 situated drivers are known to DoorDash, are readily identifiable, and can be located through  
17 DoorDash's records. Notice should be sent to the FLSA Collective pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §  
18 216(b).

19 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

20 85. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein all of the allegations contained  
21 above.

22 86. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, Plaintiffs assert claims on behalf of the following  
23 "Classes":

24 **California Class**

25 All individuals who – while working for DoorDash in California – performed one or  
26 more deliveries during the California Liability Period and who are not subject to  
27 DoorDash's arbitration clause.

28 The California Liability Period covers four years before the filing of this action to the  
date of judgment.

1                   **Illinois Class**

2                   All individuals who – while working for DoorDash in Illinois – performed one or  
3                   more deliveries within the Illinois Liability Period and who are not subject to  
4                   DoorDash’s arbitration clause.

5                   The Illinois Liability Period covers three years before the filing of this action to the  
6                   date of judgment.

7                   **Massachusetts Class**

8                   All individuals who – while working for DoorDash in Massachusetts – performed one  
9                   or more deliveries during the Massachusetts Liability Period and who are not subject  
10                  to DoorDash’s arbitration clause.

11                  The Massachusetts Liability Period covers three years before the filing of this action  
12                  to the date of judgment.

13                  87. Excluded from the Classes is Defendant, any entity in which Defendant has a  
14                  controlling interest, and Defendant’s officers, directors, legal representatives, successors,  
15                  subsidiaries, and assigns. Also excluded from the Classes is any judge, justice, or judicial officer  
16                  presiding over this matter and the members of their immediate families and judicial staff.

17                  88. Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend the Class definitions if discovery and further  
18                  investigation reveal that the Classes should be expanded, divided into subclasses, or modified in  
19                  any other way.

20                  89. Although the precise number of Class members is unknown and can only be  
21                  determined through appropriate discovery, Plaintiffs are informed and believe that the proposed  
22                  Class is so numerous that joinder of all members would be impracticable.

23                  90. Questions of law and fact common to the putative Class exist that predominate over  
24                  questions affecting only individual members, including inter alia:

25                         (A) Whether DoorDash drivers are “employees”;

26                         (B) Whether Defendant intentionally misclassified drivers as “independent  
27                                 contractors”;

28                         (C) Whether Defendant failed to pay drivers at the appropriate rates, including a  
                               guaranteed minimum wage and overtime compensation;

- 1 (D) Whether Defendant improperly enriched themselves with tips that customers left  
2 for drivers;
- 3 (E) Whether Defendant failed to reimburse drivers for business-related expenses,  
4 such as for gasoline, wear and tear on their vehicles, and costs of using their cell  
5 phones for work;
- 6 (F) Whether Defendant failed to pay DoorDash drivers for all hours worked,  
7 including hours spent waiting to be assigned an order;
- 8 (G) Whether Defendant provided adequate transparency to drivers about their pay  
9 model by furnishing itemized and accurate wage statements;
- 10 (H) Whether Defendant violated federal employment law under the FLSA, including  
11 29 U.S.C. § 206;
- 12 (I) Whether Defendant violated the California Labor Code, including §§ 218.5,  
13 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 226.8, 351, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12,  
14 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2802, 2810.5, and the California  
15 Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order No. 9-2001 (“Wage Order 9”);
- 16 (J) Whether Defendant violated Illinois labor law, including 820 ILCS 105/4, 820  
17 ILCS 105/4a, and 820 ILCS 115/9.5;
- 18 (K) Whether Defendant violated Massachusetts labor law, including M.G.L. ch. 149, §  
19 148; M.G.L. ch. 149, § 152A; M.G.L. 151 §§ 1A, 1B; M.G.L. ch. 149, § 148, *et*  
20 *seq.*; M.G.L. 151 § 1, *et seq.*; 454 C.M.R. § 27.03, *et seq.*; and M.G.L. c. 151, §  
21 20; and
- 22 (L) Whether Plaintiffs and the Classes are entitled to damages, and if so, in what  
23 amount.

24 91. Plaintiffs are members of the putative Classes. The claims asserted by the Plaintiffs in  
25 this action are typical of the claims of the members of the putative Classes, as the claims arise  
26 from the same course of conduct by the Defendant and the relief sought is common.

27 92. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the members  
28 of the putative Classes, as their interests are coincident with, not antagonistic to, the other

1 members of the Classes.

2 93. Plaintiffs have retained counsel competent and experienced in both employment and  
3 class action litigation. Plaintiffs' counsel specifically has experience litigating some of the  
4 largest and most complex employment class actions, including numerous consumer class actions  
5 in the Northern District of California.

6 94. Certification of the Classes is appropriate pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3)  
7 because questions of law or fact common to the respective members of the Classes predominate  
8 over questions of law or fact affecting only individual members. This predominance makes class  
9 litigation superior to any other method available for the fair and efficient adjudication of these  
10 claims including consistency of adjudications. Absent a class action it would be highly unlikely  
11 that Class members would be able to protect their own interests because the cost of litigation  
12 through individual lawsuits might exceed the expected recovery.

13 95. A class action is a superior method for the adjudication of the controversy in that it  
14 will permit a large number of claims to be resolved in a single forum simultaneously, efficiently,  
15 and without the unnecessary hardship that would result from the prosecution of numerous  
16 individual actions and the duplication of discovery, effort, expense, and the burden of the courts  
17 that individual actions would create.

18 96. The benefits of proceeding as a class action, including providing a method for  
19 obtaining redress for claims that would not be practical to pursue individually, outweigh any  
20 difficulties that might be argued with regard to the management of the class action.

21  
22 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

23 **Federal Minimum Wage**

24 *(on behalf of Plaintiffs and the Collective)*

25 97. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all other paragraphs as if they were set  
26 forth again herein.

27 98. Under federal law, DoorDash owes its delivery-driver employees a guaranteed  
28 minimum wage. The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) requires DoorDash to pay its drivers at



1 least \$7.25 for each hour of work.

2 99. DoorDash has not paid Plaintiffs and the Collective at the required rate for all hours  
3 worked.

4 100. In particular, although the federal minimum wage is \$7.25, Plaintiffs have earned  
5 less than the minimum wage in certain weeks due to DoorDash's low pay, coupled with the  
6 significant deductions from his pay that DoorDash requires him to make for expenses (e.g.,  
7 gasoline, car insurance, car financing, maintenance, and cell phone usage). These expenses have  
8 resulted in hourly rates below \$7.25 based on the hours that Plaintiffs have worked, the expenses  
9 they have incurred (e.g., the miles they have driven), and the wages that DoorDash has paid  
10 them. Further, although DoorDash has suffered or permitted Plaintiffs to log on to the DoorDash  
11 App and make themselves available to make deliveries, DoorDash has failed to pay them while  
12 they were logged on but not picking up or making a delivery. In this way, DoorDash has failed  
13 to pay the minimum wage for all hours actually worked and instead has limited Plaintiffs' pay to  
14 a piece rate for each delivery.

15 101. Even using DoorDash's own measurement of hours worked, Plaintiffs did not earn  
16 minimum wage for any work week, after accounting for business expenses.

17 102. **Plaintiff Clifford Linn.** The Dasher App reported that from October 28, 2019, to  
18 November 3, 2019 ("Week One"), Plaintiff Linn was paid \$554.18 and worked 47.9 hours; and  
19 from November 11, 2019, to November 17, 2019 ("Week Two"), Plaintiff was paid \$637.16 and  
20 worked 55.8 hours.

21 103. Plaintiff Linn estimates he drove approximately 550 miles during Week One and  
22 650 miles during Week Two. At the 2019 IRS mileage reimbursement rate of \$0.58 per mile,  
23 Plaintiff incurred approximately \$319 and \$377 in expenses during Weeks One and Two,  
24 respectively. Thus, accounting for mileage costs, Plaintiff's net hourly income was less than the  
25 federal minimum wage for Week One [specifically,  $(\$554.18 - \$319) \div 47.9 \text{ hours} = \$4.91 \text{ per}$   
26  $\text{hour}$ ] and Week Two [specifically,  $(\$637.16 - \$377) \div 55.8 \text{ hours} = \$4.66 \text{ per hour}$ ]. Plaintiff is  
27 informed and believes that additional information about his miles and actual hours worked is  
28 within DoorDash's custody or control.

1           **104. Plaintiff Baxter Gipson.** The Dasher App reported that from November 18, 2019,  
2 to November 24, 2019 (“Week One”), Plaintiff Gipson was paid \$458.40 and worked 48.2 hours;  
3 and from December 16, 2019, to December 22, 2019 (“Week Two”), Plaintiff was paid \$459.17  
4 and worked 46.1 hours.

5           105. Plaintiff Gipson estimates he drives approximately 400 miles per week. At the 2019  
6 IRS mileage reimbursement rate of \$0.58 per mile, Plaintiff incurred approximately \$232 per  
7 week in driving expenses. Thus, accounting for mileage costs, Plaintiff’s net hourly income was  
8 less than the federal minimum wage for Week One [specifically,  $(\$458.40 - \$232) \div 48.2 \text{ hours} =$   
9  $\$4.70$  per hour] and Week Two [specifically,  $(\$459.17 - \$232) \div 46.1 = \$4.93$  per hour]. Plaintiff  
10 is informed and believes that additional information about his miles and actual hours worked is  
11 within DoorDash’s custody or control.

12           **106. Plaintiff John Gregorio.** The Dash App reported that from January 6, 2020, to  
13 January 12, 2020 (“Week One”), Plaintiff Gregorio was paid \$646.48 and worked 40.6 hours;  
14 and from January 13, 2020, to January 19, 2020 (“Week Two”), Plaintiff was paid \$529.86 and  
15 worked 34.3 hours.

16           107. Plaintiff Gregorio estimates that he drove 1,126 miles during Week One and 1,021  
17 miles during Week Two. At the 2020 IRS mileage reimbursement rate of \$0.575 per mile,  
18 Plaintiff incurred approximately \$647.45 and \$587.08 in driving expenses during Weeks One  
19 and Two, respectively. Thus, accounting for mileage costs, Plaintiff’s net hourly income was  
20 less than the federal minimum wage for Week One [specifically,  $(\$646.48 - \$647.45) \div 40.6$   
21  $\text{hours} = -\$0.02$  per hour] and Week Two [specifically,  $(\$529.86 - \$587.08) \div 34.3 \text{ hours} = -\$1.67$   
22 per hour]. Plaintiff is informed and believes that additional information about his miles and  
23 actual hours worked is within DoorDash’s custody or control.

24           108. Plaintiffs’ hourly wages for this period were even lower after accounting for other  
25 business expenses and “reporting” time or “on-call” time, which Plaintiffs spent driving to a  
26 waiting area (“Hot Spot”) designated by DoorDash and waiting for DoorDash to assign them an  
27 order. Plaintiffs sometimes spent hours waiting to be assigned an order. Plaintiffs are informed  
28 and believe that more specific information about how long he spent “on-call” is within

1 DoorDash’s custody or control, because the Dasher App receives that information.

2 109. Plaintiffs could not take care of personal business during this “on-call” time because  
3 they had to be ready, at a moment’s notice, to accept an order or risk lowering his metrics and  
4 potentially being terminated from the App, and because they had to wait at the specified Hot  
5 Spot near popular restaurants that DoorDash predicted would receive an order soon. Plaintiffs  
6 were not able to leave and were not near their homes, so they could not do personal errands.

7 110. Although Plaintiffs periodically did not earn at least the minimum wage, DoorDash  
8 had a policy and practice of failing and refusing to pay them minimum wage for all hours  
9 worked and thus violated and continues to violate the above-referenced minimum wage  
10 protections.

11 111. Plaintiffs seek the amount of the respective unpaid wages owed them, liquidated  
12 damages, attorneys’ fees and costs pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 *et seq.* and such other legal and  
13 equitable relief as the Court deems just and proper.

14 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

15 **Federal Overtime**

16 *(on behalf of Plaintiffs and the Collective)*

17 112. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all other paragraphs as if they were  
18 set forth again herein.

19 113. Under federal law, DoorDash owes its delivery-driver employees overtime  
20 compensation for all time worked in excess of 40 hours per week.

21 114. DoorDash has failed to compensate its workers for overtime, as required by the Fair  
22 Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S. Code § 207, at a rate of 1.5 times their regular rate of pay.

23 115. Specifically, for example, DoorDash failed to pay Plaintiff Linn 7.9 hours of  
24 overtime for Week One (i.e., 47.9 hours - 40 hours) and 15.8 hours of overtime for Week Two  
25 (i.e., 55.8 hours - 40 hours); Plaintiff Gipson 8.2 hours of overtime for Week One (i.e., 48.2  
26 hours – 40 hours) and 6.1 hours of overtime for Week Two (i.e., 46.1 hours – 40 hours); and  
27 Plaintiff Gregorio 0.6 hour of overtime for Week One (i.e., 40.6 hours – 40 hours).

28 116. DoorDash has a policy and practice of failing and refusing to pay overtime and thus

1 violated and continues to violate the above-referenced overtime protections.

2 117. Plaintiffs seek the amount of the respective unpaid overtime wages owed them,  
3 liquidated damages, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 *et seq.* and such other  
4 legal and equitable relief as the Court deems just and proper.

5  
6 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

7 **California Minimum Wage**

8 *(on behalf of the California Plaintiff and California Class)*

9 118. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all other paragraphs as if they were  
10 set forth again herein.

11 119. Under California law, DoorDash owes its delivery-driver employees a guaranteed  
12 minimum wage, pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1,  
13 1199, and Wage Order 9.

14 120. DoorDash failed to pay its California drivers the legally required minimum wage for  
15 all hours worked.

16 121. As a result of this failure, the California Plaintiff and California Class are entitled to  
17 recover unpaid wages, interest, liquidated damages, costs, and attorneys' fees.

18 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

19 **California Overtime**

20 *(on behalf of the California Plaintiff and California Class)*

21 122. Plaintiffs realleges and incorporates by reference all other paragraphs as if they were  
22 set forth again herein.

23 123. Under California law, DoorDash owes its delivery-driver employees overtime  
24 compensation for all time worked in excess of 8 hours per day or 40 hours per week, and any  
25 hours worked on a 7th consecutive workday, pursuant to California Labor § 510(a) and Wage  
26 Order 9.

27 124. DoorDash has failed to compensate its California drivers for overtime, at the rates  
28 required by California law.

125. As a result of this failure, the California Plaintiff and California Class are entitled to

1 recover unpaid wages, interest, liquidated damages, costs, and attorneys' fees.

2 **FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

3 **California Itemized and Accurate Wage Statements**

4 *(on behalf of the California Plaintiff and California Class)*

5 126. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all other paragraphs as if they were  
6 set forth again herein.

7 127. Under California law, DoorDash must provide its delivery-driver employees with  
8 accurate and itemized wage statements, which include information about: (1) all wages earned,  
9 (2) all hours worked, (3) all applicable piece-rates and hours worked at each piece-rate, (4) all  
10 deductions made from wages, (5) net wages after deductions, (6) the relevant pay period, (7) the  
11 worker's name and their employer identification number or last four digits of their Social  
12 Security number, (8) name and address of the legal entity that officially employs the worker, and  
13 (9) all applicable hourly rates and hours worked at each hourly rate.

14 128. DoorDash has failed to provide accurate and itemized paystubs to its California  
15 drivers, as required by California Labor Code § 226 and Wage Order 9.

16 129. When paying its drivers, DoorDash failed to provide the transparency required by  
17 California law because it did not furnish paystubs to clearly and accurately disclose to its drivers,  
18 among other things: all hours worked; all applicable rates at which they were paid; the extent to  
19 which tips affected these pay rates; the total hours worked at each applicable pay rate; the  
20 worker's name and identification number; and the legal entity that is officially employing  
21 drivers.

22 130. To the extent that DoorDash lists total hours worked, this information does not  
23 constitute an *accurate* wage statement because it does not include "reporting" time, when drivers  
24 reported for work but were not immediately assigned to a delivery. In many cases, DoorDash  
25 instructed drivers to relocate to a different location to await orders, but DoorDash did not include  
26 time spent driving to a new location within total hours worked.

27 131. The California Plaintiff was harmed by DoorDash's lack of transparency in its wage  
28 statements because, among other things, he was unable to determine precisely how he was being

1 compensated and whether it was worth his time to continue working for DoorDash; was unable  
2 to determine whether he was receiving all their tips, a subject of much public controversy; and  
3 was not provided important information to protect his legal rights, such as the legal entity that  
4 officially employed him.

5 132. At all times relevant herein, DoorDash has failed to maintain accurate records of  
6 hours worked by Plaintiff as required under Wage Order 9 and Labor Code § 1174(d).

7 133. Plaintiff seeks the amounts provided under Wage Order 9 and Labor Code sections  
8 226(e), 226.3, and 1174(d), as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

9 **SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

10 **California Meal and Rest Breaks**

11 *(on behalf of the California Plaintiff and California Class)*

12 134. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all other paragraphs as if they were  
13 set forth again herein.

14 135. At all relevant times, Defendant has been an employer and Plaintiff has been an  
15 employee under California law entitled to the protections of the California Labor Code and Wage  
16 Order 9.

17 136. California Plaintiff and class members regularly worked in excess of five-hour shifts  
18 without being afforded at least a half-hour meal break in which they relieved of all duty, as  
19 required by Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and Wage Order No. 9, Section 11.

20 137. In addition, California Plaintiff and class members regularly worked without being  
21 afforded at least one ten-minute rest break, in which they were relieved of all duty, per four  
22 hours of work performed or major fraction thereof, as required by Labor Code section 226.7 and  
23 Wage Order 9, Section 12.

24 138. As a result of Defendant's failure to afford proper meal periods, it is liable to  
25 California Plaintiff and class members for one hour of additional pay at the regular rate of  
26 compensation for each workday that the proper meal periods were not provided, pursuant to  
27 Labor Code section 226.7 and Wage Order No. 9.

28 139. As a result of Defendant's failure to afford proper rest periods, it is liable to

1 California Plaintiff and class members for one hour of additional pay at the regular rate of  
2 compensation for each workday that the proper rest periods were not provided, pursuant to Labor  
3 Code § 226.7 and Wage Order No. 9, interest, costs, and attorneys’ fees.

4 **SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

5 **California Business Expense Reimbursement**

6 *(on behalf of the California Plaintiff and California Class)*

7 140. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all other paragraphs as if they were  
8 set forth again herein.

9 141. California Labor Code § 2802 provides that “[a]n employer shall indemnify his or  
10 her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct  
11 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties.”

12 142. Defendant failed to indemnify and reimburse California drivers for necessary  
13 expenditures they incurred as a direct result of the duties they performed for the Defendant’s  
14 benefit and/or at the Defendant’s direction, including costs of gasoline, car insurance, car  
15 maintenance, depreciation and repairs, and cell phone usage that was necessary to perform the  
16 work.

17 143. Wage Order 9 provides that “[w]hen tools or equipment are required by the  
18 employer or are necessary to the performance of a job, such tools and equipment shall be  
19 provided and maintained by the employer.”

20 144. Defendant failed to provide and maintain tools and equipment that Plaintiff and  
21 class members required to perform their duties, including a vehicle, gasoline, car insurance,  
22 reimbursement for car maintenance, depreciation, and repairs, and cell phone usage.

23 145. As a result, the California Plaintiff and class members seek unreimbursed expenses,  
24 penalties, interest, costs incurred, and attorneys’ fees pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(b) and  
25 Wage Order 9.

26 **EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

27 **California Tips**

28 *(on behalf of the California Plaintiff and California Class)*

1 146. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all other paragraphs as if they were  
2 set forth again herein.

3 147. DoorDash often keeps drivers' tips in order to defray its costs. This violates Cal.  
4 Labor Code § 351: "No employer or agent shall . . . deduct any amount from wages due an  
5 employee on account of a gratuity[.]" Under California law, DoorDash must pay its workers all  
6 tips they earn, in addition to minimum wage.

7 148. Further, Defendant misappropriated drivers' tips through DoorDash's "Drive"  
8 program. Under this program, certain restaurants, caterers, and grocery chains have a deal with  
9 DoorDash, under which they can request Dashers to make a particular delivery for them.

10 149. The restaurant, caterer, or grocer must pay the Dasher. In turn, the Dasher must  
11 collect payment from the customer. The customer's payment goes in its entirety to the  
12 restaurant, caterer, or grocer. DoorDash's policy and practice does not require the restaurant,  
13 caterer, or grocer to pass on tips to the driver. Certain restaurants and grocery chains, such as  
14 Chipotle and Walmart, are notorious for not passing on tips to their DoorDash drivers.

15 150. As a result of Defendant's failure to pass on all tips, the California Plaintiff and  
16 California Class are entitled to recover unpaid tips, interest, liquidated damages, costs, and  
17 attorneys' fees.

18 **NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

19 **California Unfair Business Practices**

20 *(on behalf of the California Plaintiff and California Class)*

21 151. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all other paragraphs as if they were  
22 set forth again herein.

23 152. At all relevant times, Defendant has been an employer and California Plaintiff and  
24 class members have been employees under California law, entitled to the protections of the  
25 California Labor Code and Wage Order 9.

26 153. The foregoing conduct, as alleged, violates the California Unfair Competition Law  
27 ("UCL"), Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.* Section 17200 of the Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code  
28 prohibits unfair competition by prohibiting, inter alia, any unlawful or unfair business acts or



1 practices.

2 154. Within the four years before the filing of this action, Defendant committed, and  
3 continues to commit, acts of unfair competition, as defined by the UCL, by, among other things,  
4 engaging in the acts and practices described herein. Defendant's conduct as herein alleged has  
5 injured California Plaintiff and class members by wrongfully denying them of their earned  
6 wages, and therefore was substantially injurious to them.

7 155. Defendant engaged in unfair competition in violation of the UCL by violating, inter  
8 alia, each of the following laws. Each of these violations constitutes an independent and separate  
9 violation of the UCL:

- 10 a. Wage Order 9;
- 11 b. Labor Code § 226.8, which makes it unlawful for employers to willfully  
12 misclassify workers as independent contractors, and to charge an individual  
13 who has been willfully misclassified as an independent contractor a fee, or  
14 make any deductions from compensation, for any purpose including for goods,  
15 materials, services, licenses, repairs, equipment maintenance, or fines arising  
16 from the individual's employment where any of the acts described would have  
17 violated the law if the individual had not been misclassified;
- 18 c. Labor Code §§ 221 and 2802;
- 19 d. Labor Code §§ 1182.2, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1199;
- 20 e. Labor Code §§ 226, 353, and 1174;
- 21 f. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512;
- 22 g. Labor Code § 2810.5;
- 23 h. Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226, 226.7, and 512;
- 24 i. Labor Code § 351, which makes it unlawful for an employer to deduct any  
25 amount from wages due an employee on account of gratuity.

26 156. Defendant has not paid California drivers all the tips they received from customers,  
27 even though they are entitled to these tips, in addition to minimum wage.

28 157. Defendant's course of conduct, acts, and practices in violation of the California laws

1 mentioned above constitute a separate and independent violation of the UCL.

2 158. Defendant's conduct described herein also violates the policy or spirit of such laws  
3 or otherwise significantly threatens or harms competition.

4 159. Defendant's conduct is additionally unfair because the harm from the conduct  
5 alleged herein vastly outweighs the benefits. DoorDash, for example, misled customers into  
6 thinking that tips will increase their driver's earnings, when in reality, DoorDash used the tips to  
7 defray its labor costs.

8 160. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violations of the UCL, California  
9 Plaintiff and class members lost money or property, including but not limited to wages, expense  
10 reimbursements, penalties, and tips owed to them.

11 161. California Plaintiff and class members seeks restitution of all expenses, minimum  
12 wages, and other wages owed, plus attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Cal. Code of Civil  
13 Procedure § 1021.5.

14 **TENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

15 **Illinois Minimum Wage**

16 *(on behalf of the Illinois Plaintiff and Illinois Class)*

17 162. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all other paragraphs as if they were  
18 set forth again herein.

19 163. Under Illinois law, DoorDash owes its delivery-driver employees a guaranteed  
20 minimum wage, pursuant to 820 ILCS 105/4.

21 164. DoorDash failed to pay its Illinois drivers the legally required minimum wage for all  
22 hours worked.

23 165. As a result of this failure, the Illinois Plaintiff and Illinois Class are entitled to  
24 recover unpaid wages, interest, liquidated damages, costs, and attorneys' fees.

25 **ELEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

26 **Illinois Overtime**

27 *(on behalf of the Illinois Plaintiff and Illinois Class)*

28 166. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all other paragraphs as if they were

1 set forth again herein.

2 167. Under Illinois law, DoorDash owes its delivery-driver employees overtime  
3 compensation for all time worked in excess of 40 hours per week, pursuant to 820 ILCS 105/4a.

4 168. DoorDash has failed to compensate its Illinois drivers for overtime, at the rates  
5 required by Illinois law.

6 169. As a result of this failure, the Illinois Plaintiff and Illinois Class are entitled to  
7 recover unpaid wages, interest, liquidated damages, costs, and attorneys' fees.

8 **TWELFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

9 **Illinois Business Expense Reimbursement**

10 *(on behalf of the Illinois Plaintiff and Illinois Class)*

11 170. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all other paragraphs as if they were  
12 set forth again herein.

13 171. Illinois law, pursuant to 820 ILCS 115/9.5, requires that “[a]n employer shall  
14 reimburse an employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee” for  
15 anything that is “directly related to services performed for the employer.”

16 172. Defendant failed to indemnify and reimburse Illinois drivers for necessary  
17 expenditures they incurred as a direct result of the duties they performed for the Defendant’s  
18 primary benefit and/or at the Defendant’s direction, including costs of gasoline, car insurance,  
19 car maintenance, depreciation and repairs, and cell phone usage that was necessary to perform  
20 the work.

21 173. As a result, the Illinois Plaintiff and the Illinois Class seek unreimbursed expenses,  
22 penalties, interest, costs incurred, and attorneys’ fees.

23 **THIRTEENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

24 **Massachusetts Minimum Wage**

25 *(on behalf of the Massachusetts Plaintiff and Massachusetts Class)*

26 174. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all other paragraphs as if they were  
27 set forth again herein.

28 175. Under Massachusetts law, DoorDash owes its delivery-driver employees a

1 guaranteed minimum wage, pursuant to M.G.L. ch. 149, § 148, *et seq.*; M.G.L. 151 § 1, *et seq.*;  
2 454 C.M.R. § 27.03, *et seq.*; and M.G.L. c. 151, § 20.

3 176. DoorDash failed to pay its Massachusetts drivers the legally required minimum  
4 wage for all hours worked.

5 177. As a result of this failure, the Massachusetts Plaintiff and Massachusetts Class are  
6 entitled to recover unpaid wages, interest, liquidated damages, costs, and attorneys' fees.

7 **FOURTEENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

8 **Massachusetts Overtime**

9 *(on behalf of the Massachusetts Plaintiff and Massachusetts Class)*

10 178. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all other paragraphs as if they were  
11 set forth again herein.

12 179. Under Massachusetts law, DoorDash owes its delivery-driver employees overtime  
13 compensation for all time worked in excess of 40 hours per week, pursuant to M.G.L. 151 §§ 1A,  
14 1B.

15 180. DoorDash has failed to compensate its Massachusetts drivers for overtime, at the  
16 rates required by Massachusetts law.

17 181. As a result of this failure, the Massachusetts Plaintiff and Massachusetts Class are  
18 entitled to recover unpaid wages, interest, liquidated damages, costs, and attorneys' fees.

19 **FIFTEENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

20 **Massachusetts Business Expense Reimbursement**

21 *(on behalf of the Massachusetts Plaintiff and Massachusetts Class)*

22 182. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all other paragraphs as if they were  
23 set forth again herein.

24 183. Massachusetts law, pursuant to M.G.L. ch. 149, § 148, *et seq.*, is clear that “an  
25 employer cannot effectively reduce an employee's wages by shifting business costs to the  
26 employee.” *Martins v. 3PD Inc.*, No. CIV.A. 11-11313-DPW, 2014 WL 1271761, at \*6 (D.  
27 Mass. Mar. 27, 2014).

28 184. Defendant failed to indemnify and reimburse Massachusetts drivers for necessary

1 expenditures they incurred as a direct result of the duties they performed for the Defendant's  
2 benefit and/or at the Defendant's direction, including costs of gasoline, car insurance, car  
3 maintenance, depreciation and repairs, and cell phone usage that was necessary to perform the  
4 work. Defendant's effectively reduced Massachusetts drivers' wages by shifting these business  
5 costs to them.

6 185. As a result, the Massachusetts Plaintiff and the Massachusetts Class seek  
7 unreimbursed expenses, liquidated damages, interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

8 **SIXTEENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

9 **Massachusetts Tips**

10 *(on behalf of the Massachusetts Plaintiff and Massachusetts Class)*

11 186. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all other paragraphs as if they were  
12 fully set forth herein.

13 187. Under Massachusetts law, pursuant to M.G.L. ch. 149, § 152A, a company must  
14 give service employees all tips left for them by customers. The statute imposes "strict civil  
15 liability" on an employer if its delivery drivers do not receive their tips. *Mooney v. Domino's*  
16 *Pizza, Inc.*, No. 1:14-CV-13723-IT, 2016 WL 4576996, at \*4 (D. Mass. Sept. 1, 2016).  
17 Employers may not retain any part of tips left for employees and may not require deductions  
18 from tips that would reduce employees' overall wages. M.G.L. ch. 149, § 152A(b).

19 188. DoorDash retained part or all of its Massachusetts drivers' tips to offset its own  
20 costs, rather than remitting tips to increase drivers' overall pay. DoorDash "Drive" partners kept  
21 all or part of Massachusetts' drivers' tips to enrich the corporation, rather than the drivers.

22 189. As a result, the Massachusetts Plaintiff and the Massachusetts Class seek  
23 unreimbursed expenses, liquidated damages, interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

24 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

25 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as follows:

26 A. An Order certifying this action as a collective and class action, and  
27 appointing Plaintiffs as collective and class representatives and Plaintiffs' counsel as counsel for  
28 the collective and the classes;

1 B. A declaratory judgment that the practices complained of herein are  
2 unlawful and that Plaintiffs and Class members are “employees” under federal, California,  
3 Illinois, and Massachusetts law;

4 C. An injunction against Defendant, its officers, agents, successors,  
5 employees, representatives, and any and all persons acting in concert with it, as provided by law,  
6 from engaging in each of the unlawful practices set forth herein;

7 D. Statutory penalties and liquidated damages;

8 E. An award of damages and restitution to be paid by Defendant according to  
9 proof;

10 F. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, as provided by law;

11 G. Such other injunctive and equitable relief as is just and proper;

12 H. Reasonable service awards for the collective and class representatives; and

13 I. Reasonable costs, and attorneys’ fees.

14 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

15  
16 Plaintiffs demand trial by jury for all issues so triable.

17 Dated: January 29, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

18 By: /s/ Steven M. Tindall

19 Steven M. Tindall (Cal. Bar No. 187862)  
20 Aaron Blumenthal (Cal. Bar No. 310605)  
21 Nikul Shah (Cal. Bar No. 321282)  
**GIBBS LAW GROUP LLP**  
22 505 14th Street, Suite 1110  
Oakland, CA 94612  
23 Telephone: 510-350-9700  
Facsimile: 510-350-9701  
24 E-Mail: [smt@classlawgroup.com](mailto:smt@classlawgroup.com)  
E-Mail: [ab@classlawgroup.com](mailto:ab@classlawgroup.com)  
25 E-Mail: [ns@classlawgroup.com](mailto:ns@classlawgroup.com)

1  
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  
28

Jahan Sagafi (Cal. Bar No. 224887)  
Relic Sun (Cal. Bar No. 306701)  
Molly Frandsen (Cal. Bar No. 320094)  
**OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP**  
One California Street, 12th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 638-8800  
Facsimile: (415) 638-8810  
E-Mail: jsagafi@outtengolden.com  
E-Mail: rsun@outtengolden.com  
E-Mail: mfrandsen@outtengolden.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*