

1 Jahan C. Sagafi (State Bar No. 224887)  
2 Molly J. Frandsen (State Bar No. 320094)  
3 Hannah Meropol (State Bar No. 340095)  
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 Email: [jsagafi@outtengolden.com](mailto:jsagafi@outtengolden.com)  
10 Email: [mfrandsen@outtengolden.com](mailto:mfrandsen@outtengolden.com)  
11 Email: [hmeropol@outtengolden.com](mailto:hmeropol@outtengolden.com)

12 Chris Baker (State Bar No. 181577)  
13 Deborah Schwartz (State Bar No. 208934)  
14 BAKER DOLINKO & SCHWARTZ, P.C.  
15 One California Street, Suite 1250  
16 San Francisco, CA 94111  
17 Telephone: (415) 433-1064  
18 Facsimile: (415) 422-9966  
19 Email: [cbaker@bakerlp.com](mailto:cbaker@bakerlp.com)  
20 Email: [dschwartz@bakerlp.com](mailto:dschwartz@bakerlp.com)

21 *Attorneys for Plaintiff, on behalf of himself,*  
22 *other Aggrieved Employees, and for the State*  
23 *of California*

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  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

18 AMAR BHAKTA,

19 Plaintiff,

20 v.

21 APPLE, INC.,

22 Defendant.

Case No.

**PAGA COMPLAINT**

**First PAGA Claim - Speech Suppression**

**Second PAGA Claim –Privacy Violations,  
Surveillance, and Forced Patronage**

**Third PAGA Claim – Wage Clawbacks**

Complaint Filed: Dec.2, 2024

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1 Introduction..... 4

2 I. Claim One: Apple’s Systematic Suppression of Employee Speech

3 and Competition ..... 4

4 I.A. The California Legislature Has Determined That Policies Limiting

5 Certain Types of Employee Speech Are Unlawful Because Such

6 Policies Undermine Societal Goals of Nondiscrimination, Free

7 Movement of Labor, Fair Competition, and Shining a Light on

8 Corporate Misconduct ..... 4

9 I.B. Apple’s Speech Suppression Policies Violate California Law

10 in Several Ways..... 5

11 II. Claim Two: Apple’s Systematic Invasion of Employee Privacy and

12 Forced Patronage Violates California Law ..... 9

13 III. Claim Three: Apple’s Illegal Clawback Policies and Practices

14 Violate California Law ..... 10

15 Parties..... 11

16 Jurisdiction and Venue..... 11

17 Statement of Facts..... 11

18 I. Apple’s Speech Suppression Policies Have Violated Bhakta’s Rights

19 As an Apple Employee..... 11

20 II. Apple’s Speech Suppression Policies Are Evident in Multiple Documents

21 and Through Various Actions Taken by the Company ..... 13

22 II.A. Apple’s Intellectual Property Agreement (“IPA”)..... 13

23 II.A.1. Information Restraints ..... 13

24 II.A.2. Other Restraints of Trade ..... 14

25 II.B. Apple’s Business Conduct Policy (“BCP”)..... 14

26 II.C. Apple’s Security Policies ..... 15

27 II.D. Apple’s Enforcement Practices ..... 16

28 II.E. Bhakta’s Experience..... 17

III. Apple Invades Its Employees’ Privacy and Compels Their Patronage..... 17

III.A. Apple’s Collection and Use of The Privacies of Life ..... 17

III.B. Apple Owned vs Apple Managed ..... 20

III.C. iCloud@Apple ..... 21

III.D. Apple’s Surveillance..... 22

III.E. No Escape..... 22

III.F. Bhakta’s Experience ..... 23

IV. Apple’s Illegal Clawback Policies and Practices ..... 24

|    |   |    |
|----|---|----|
| 1  | IV.A. Apple’s Forfeiture Provisions.....  | 24 |
| 2  | IV.B. Bhakta’s Experience .....   | 24 |
| 3  | V. Apple’s “Carveout” Provisions .....  | 24 |
| 4  | VI. Administrative Exhaustion .....   | 25 |
| 5  | First Cause of Action   |    |
| 6  | Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698 <i>et seq.</i>              |    |
| 7  | Speech Suppression, Which Restrains Competition, Speech and Whistle Blowing ..... | 25 |
| 8  | Second Cause of Action  |    |
| 9  | Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698 <i>et seq.</i>              |    |
| 10 | Privacy Violations, Surveillance, and Forced Patronage.....                       | 26 |
| 11 | Third Cause of Action   |    |
| 12 | Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698 <i>et seq.</i>              |    |
| 13 | Illegal Clawback Policies and Practices .....                                     | 27 |

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

## INTRODUCTION

1           1.       This action challenges three categories of unlawful conduct by Defendant Apple,  
2 Inc. that aggrieves all Apple employees and harms all Californians: (1) Apple’s suppression of  
3 employee speech through unlawful speech suppression rules and otherwise; (2) Apple’s invasion  
4 of employee privacy through surveillance and forced patronage through use of their non-work  
5 private data; and (3) Apple’s clawback of earned wages. These three categories of conduct each  
6 give rise to distinct claims under California’s Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”), as set  
7 forth in the First, Second, and Third Causes of Action, respectively. In other words, Plaintiff can  
8 prevail by proving one PAGA violation without proving another. However, as a practical matter,  
9 Apple’s unlawful conduct that underlies these PAGA violations is mutually reinforcing and  
10 interrelated, as the proliferation of unlawful policies and practices may infringe on multiple labor  
11 code protections.

12           2.       Plaintiff Amar Bhakta brings this action under California’s Private Attorneys  
13 General Act (“PAGA”), Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698 et seq. on behalf of himself and other current  
14 and former employees and the State of California to recover for violations of the California  
15 Labor Code.

16           3.       Plaintiff also seeks appropriate injunctive relief to protect Aggrieved Employees  
17 and the State of California from future violations.

### **I.       Claim One: Apple’s Systematic Suppression of Employee Speech and Competition**

#### **I.A.   The California Legislature Has Determined That Policies Limiting Certain Types of Employee Speech Are Unlawful Because Such Policies Undermine Societal Goals of Nondiscrimination, Free Movement of Labor, Fair Competition, and Shining a Light on Corporate Misconduct**

23           4.       The California Legislature has enacted a group of laws that protect Californians’  
24 rights to be free from employer interference in disclosing information about wages and working  
25 conditions, reporting suspected legal violations, participating freely in our democracy through  
26 the exercise of political activity, and practicing their trade or profession. California’s duly  
27 elected representatives enacted these statutes to protect workers’ economic interests and personal  
28

1 autonomy by empowering them to speak freely about compensation and the details of their job  
2 duties and working conditions, to ensure a fair society by eliminating pay discrimination and  
3 other mistreatment, and to promote a reliable economy in which businesses compete on a level  
4 playing field and unfair competition is quickly rooted out. These laws, collectively, establish as  
5 a minimum employment standard an employee *anti-gag* rule. *Doe. v. Google* (2020) 54  
6 Cal.App.5<sup>th</sup> 948.<sup>1</sup>

7 5. The California Legislature has enacted the following laws, all of which Apple  
8 violates through the use of its Speech Suppression Policies:

- 9 a. **Labor Code §§ 232, 232.5, and 1197.5(k)**, which prohibit employers from  
10 requiring employees to refrain from disclosing information about their wages  
11 and their working conditions. These laws protect Californians’ right to be free  
12 from discrimination.
- 13 b. **Labor Code § 1102.5 and Government Code § 12964.5**, which protect  
14 workers’ rights to whistleblowing. This law protects the ability of workers to  
15 raise concerns about unlawful activity, which protects all Californians who  
16 can be negatively impacted by wrongdoing, such as pollution and antitrust  
17 violations.
- 18 c. **Labor Code §§ 96(k), 98.6, 1101 and 1102**, which prohibit employers from  
19 placing restraints upon employee political activity and their lives outside of  
20 work. These laws, among other things, ensure employees may participate in  
21 democracy and advocate for causes that, in their view, further the public good,  
22 even if their employer disagrees.
- 23 d. **Labor Code § 432.5**, which prohibits employers from requiring an employee  
24 to sign a writing it knows is prohibited by law.

25 **I.B. Apple’s Speech Suppression Policies Violate California Law in Several Ways**

26 6. **Apple imposes these policies on its workers.** As a condition of employment,  
27

28 <sup>1</sup> In this Complaint, Plaintiff generally uses the terms “speech suppression” or “gag rules” to refer to violations of California’s anti-gag rule.

1 Defendant Apple, Inc. (“Apple”) requires all employees, including contingent workers  
2 (collectively, “Apple employees”) to comply with agreements, policies, guidelines, and practices  
3 governing employee speech (“Speech Suppression Policies”) that violate California worker  
4 protection laws by unlawfully restricting the employees’ speech and limiting their ability to get  
5 jobs after working at Apple. Apple’s Speech Restriction Policies purport to remain in effect  
6 throughout each employee’s employment and beyond, for the life of the employee.

7       7.       **Apple’s Speech Suppression Policies.** Apple maintains companywide policies  
8 that suppress its employees’ speech in violation of California law. Through its employment  
9 agreements, written policy documents, and practice of enforcement, Apple unlawfully prohibits  
10 the disclosure of information that the Labor Code empowers employees to disclose, in the  
11 Legislature’s judgment. The broad definition of confidential information in Apple’s form  
12 employment agreement includes “the employment and personnel information of Apple, such as  
13 compensation, training, recruiting, and other human resource information.” Its Business  
14 Conduct Policy expressly prohibits Apple employees from disclosing their coworkers’  
15 compensation information, prohibits them from engaging in any “outside activity” that *could*  
16 have an adverse effect on their ability to perform their duties at Apple, and places restraints on its  
17 employees’ political activities.

18       8.       **Speech that facilitates workers’ ability to get a job.** Apple’s conduct also  
19 violates California law by prohibiting restraints on trade. *See* California Business & Professions  
20 Code §§ 16600 *et seq.* The overbroad confidentiality restriction in Apple’s employment  
21 agreement limits employees’ freedom to speak about their work and Apple’s business, which  
22 restricts them from using their own skills and knowledge, developed at Apple, both in a job  
23 search and after hire. *See* Jodi L. Short, Killing the Messenger: The Use of Nondisclosure  
24 Agreements to Silence Whistleblowers, 60 U. Pitt. L. Rev. 1207, 1220 (1999) (noting that  
25 agreements restricting disclosure make it more difficult for individuals to obtain new  
26 employment in the same field, because “[t]he skills and industry knowledge an employee learns  
27 at one job often constitute her most valuable assets in seeking and obtaining a subsequent job”).  
28 The employment agreement’s express language prohibiting departing Apple employees from

1 soliciting other Apple employees or contractors after they leave employment with Apple also  
2 unlawfully restricts trade. Apple’s conduct not only violates speech and worker mobility  
3 protections but also undermines legislative intent underlying those protections to combat  
4 discriminatory pay disparities and improve worker mobility.

5       **9. Speech that protects against discrimination.** Apple’s conduct violates  
6 California Labor Code provisions that explicitly protect employees who disclose or discuss their  
7 wages and working conditions, either with coworkers or outsiders. Labor Code § 232 provides  
8 that no employer may “[r]equire, as a condition of employment, that an employee refrain from  
9 disclosing the amount of his or her wages.” § 232(a). Section 232(b) also prohibits requiring an  
10 employee to sign a “waiver or other document” that purports to deny the right to disclose one’s  
11 wages. Labor Code § 232.5 extends similar protections to other aspects of the employment  
12 relationship, providing that no employer may “[r]equire, as a condition of employment, that an  
13 employee refrain from disclosing information about the employer’s working conditions.” Labor  
14 Code § 1197.5(k), which is part of the California Equal Pay Act, states that “an employer shall  
15 not prohibit an employee from disclosing the employee’s own wages, discussing the wages of  
16 others, inquiring about another’s wages, or aiding or encouraging any other employee to exercise  
17 his or her rights under this section.” The legislative history underlying these Labor Code  
18 provisions emphasizes how employer policies prohibiting disclosures about wages exacerbate  
19 discriminatory pay disparities. *See, e.g.*, 2015 Cal. Legis. Serv. Ch. 546 (SB 358 § 1(d)) (“Pay  
20 secrecy also contributes to the gender wage gap, because women cannot challenge wage  
21 discrimination that they do not know exists.”); *Doe v. Google, Inc.* (2020) 54 Cal.App.5th 948,  
22 958 (stating Labor Code § 1197.5(k) was enacted “at the urging of women’s groups to protect  
23 employees sharing information necessary to the enforcement of laws against sex discrimination”)  
24 (citing Sen. Com. on Industrial Relations, Staff Analysis of Assem. Bill No. 3193 (1983–1984  
25 Reg. Sess.)).

26       **10. Whistleblower Speech That Protects Against Corporate Wrongdoing.**  
27 Apple’s conduct also violates California’s whistleblower protections. For example, Labor Code  
28 § 1102.5 protects an employee’s right to disclose, both within a company and externally,

1 employer conduct the employee has a reasonable cause to believe constitutes a legal violation.  
2 The broad purview of this whistleblower protection to cover employee disclosures regarding any  
3 legal violation was an express purpose of the legislature in its enactment. *See* 2013 Cal. Legis.  
4 Serv. Ch. 732 (AB 263 § 1(g)) (“No employee should have to fear adverse action, whether it  
5 involves threats to cut hours, move a worker to night shift, or contact law enforcement agencies,  
6 simply for engaging in rights the State of California has deemed so important that they are  
7 protected by law.”).

8       11.     **Speech That Allows Employees to Participate in Democracy and Advocate**  
9 **for the Public Good.** Apple’s conduct violates sections of the Labor Code that prohibit  
10 employers from placing restraints upon employee political activity and their lives outside of  
11 work. Labor Code §§ 1101 and 1102 prohibit employers from adopting a rule or policy  
12 “[c]ontrolling or directing, or tending to control or direct the political activities or affiliations of  
13 employees” and prohibit employers from “coerc[ing] or influenc[ing] or attempt[ing] to coerce  
14 or influence his employees through or by means of threat of discharge or loss of employment to  
15 adopt or follow or refrain from adopting or following any particular course or line of political  
16 action or political activity.” Labor Code §§ 96(k) and 98.6 prohibit employer restraints on the  
17 nonwork aspects of its employees’ lives, as well as restraints on the exercise of Labor Code  
18 rights.

19       12.     **Signatures on Unlawful Policies.** The unlawful provisions of Apple’s  
20 employment agreement additionally violate Labor Code § 432.5, which prohibits an employer  
21 from requiring an employee to sign a writing that it knows is prohibited by law.

22       13.     **Lifetime effect.** Apple’s Speech Suppression Policies purport to remain in effect  
23 throughout each employee’s employment and beyond, for the life of the employee.

24       14.     **The harm from Apple’s Speech Suppression Policies.** Apple’s Speech  
25 Suppression Policies have harmed – and continue to harm – Apple’s employees and the State of  
26 California just as the Legislature feared. For example, Apple prohibited Plaintiff Bhakta from  
27 speaking about his work experience on podcasts and instructed Bhakta to remove information  
28 about his working conditions and work experiences from his LinkedIn profile. On information



1 and belief, Apple’s Speech Suppression Policies limit Apple employees’ ability to describe their  
2 job responsibilities, accomplishments, and professional growth to a potential future employer  
3 when exploring new opportunities, and they prohibit or restrain Apple employees from  
4 disclosing – or using – all of the skills, knowledge, connections, and overall experience they  
5 developed at Apple when working for a subsequent employer. Apple’s Speech Suppression  
6 Policies prohibit or restrain Apple employees from speaking with each other or outsiders (like  
7 friends, family members, reporters, etc.) about potential problems at work, such as unfair  
8 treatment, harassment, discrimination, retaliation, or even sexual assault. Similarly, Apple’s  
9 Speech Suppression Policies prohibit Apple employees from bringing to light compensation  
10 issues, including underpayment or under-leveling of people of color, women, older workers, or  
11 any other group. The secrecy permits the wrongdoing to continue. This is a real and ongoing  
12 concern. Two women recently filed a proposed class and PAGA action against Apple on behalf  
13 of all women in the Engineering, Marketing, and AppleCare divisions, alleging that Apple  
14 systematically underpays women in violation of the Equal Pay Act. *Jong v. Apple, Inc.*, Case  
15 No. CGC-24-615363 (San Francisco Superior Court).

16 15. Apple’s Speech Suppression Policies are contrary to the laws described herein  
17 and are contrary to the interests of the State of California.

18 **II. Claim Two: Apple’s Systematic Invasion of Employee Privacy and Forced**  
19 **Patronage Violates California Law**

20 16. More than 50 years ago, the People of California amended their Constitution to  
21 include the inalienable right of all people to privacy. The moving force behind this amendment  
22 was “the accelerating encroachment on personal freedom and security caused by increased  
23 surveillance and data collection activity in contemporary society.” At its most basic, this right  
24 recognizes and protects individual autonomy. It encompasses the right to *decide* “to what extent  
25 [a person’s] thoughts, sentiments, and emotions are communicated to others.” It provides  
26 “immunity from suspicious and jealous observation.” And it grants *to the individual* “the ability  
27 to control the circulation of personal information.”

28 17. The California Legislature also has enacted employment laws that protect

1 employee autonomy and privacy. Labor Code §§ 96(k) and 98.6 prohibit employer attempts “to  
2 control the nonwork aspects of their employees’ lives.” Labor Code § 450 prohibits employers  
3 from requiring their employees’ patronage, or to pay for their job, with consideration *of any type*,  
4 including their nonwork private data. Labor Code § 432.5 prevents employers from requiring  
5 their employees to sign contracts and other writings known to be prohibited by law.

6 18. In violation of these laws, Apple requires employees to waive their inalienable  
7 right to privacy and autonomy, and to patronize Apple, as a condition of their employment.  
8 Apple requires the use of Apple devices, software, and services for work, including personal  
9 iCloud accounts. Whether owned by Apple or the employee, these devices collect and use the  
10 valuable personal data of Apple employees, and those with whom they interact, when the  
11 employees are engaged in the “life” side of the work/life balance, i.e., during nonwork periods  
12 and while away from Apple’s premises (“Private Life Data.”) Apple also requires employees to  
13 agree that they have no right to privacy in their Private Life Data (including location data), that  
14 Apple can engage in physical, video, and electronic surveillance of them and that it can, as it  
15 wishes, search both Apple and non-Apple devices and other property while an employee is on  
16 “company premises.” which – according to one Apple policy – can include an employee’s *home*  
17 office.

18 19. For Apple’s employees, the Apple ecosystem is not a walled garden. It is a  
19 prison yard. A panopticon where employees, both on and off duty, are ever subject to Apple’s  
20 all-seeing eye.

21 **III. Claim Three: Apple’s Illegal Clawback Policies and Practices Violate California**  
22 **Law**

23 20. Finally, the California Legislature has enacted laws intended to ensure that  
24 employees are actually paid the wages they earn. Labor Code § 221 prohibits an employer from  
25 clawing back earned wages – including Restricted Stock Units (RSUs). Labor Code § 206.5  
26 states that an employer shall not require the execution of a release of a claim or right on account  
27 of wages to become due unless the wages have already been paid.

28 21. Despite these laws, Apple conditions the payment of vested Restricted Stock

1 Units – wages that will become due – on a release of their right to these vested RSUs if Apple  
2 “reasonably determines” the employee has, among other things, engaged in the unauthorized  
3 disclosure of “confidential information,” or “materially breached” their employment agreement,  
4 which, as detailed below, requires compliance with Apple’s unlawful Speech Suppression  
5 Policies rules and surveillance practices.

6 **PARTIES**

7 22. Plaintiff Amar Bhakta is a current Apple employee and agent of the State of  
8 California within the meaning of PAGA. Among other things, and as further detailed below, he  
9 was and is subject to Apple’s unlawful employment agreements, policies, and practices. He is  
10 aggrieved by one or more of Apple’s violations of the Labor Code.

11 23. Apple, Inc. is a California corporation doing business in California and  
12 maintaining corporate headquarters in Santa Clara County.

13 24. At all relevant times, Apple was Plaintiff’s employer within the meaning of the  
14 Labor Code.

15 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

16 25. The Court has jurisdiction over this action because the action involves issues of  
17 state law. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to section 395.5 of the California  
18 Code of Civil Procedure, because Apple’s principal place of business is situated in Santa Clara  
19 County.

20 **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

21 **I. Apple’s Speech Suppression Policies Have Violated Bhakta’s Rights As an Apple  
22 Employee**

23 26. According to its website, Apple employs 80,000 individuals in the United States.  
24 In California, it has more than 36,000 employees, 53 retail stores, and numerous corporate  
25 offices. Its employment agreements, policies, procedures, and practices are, by necessity,  
26 standardized. Accordingly, and on information and belief, Bhakta’s experience and encounters  
27 with Apple’s Labor Code violations, including its restraints on speech and individual autonomy,  
28 is emblematic of all Apple employees.

27 27. In or around July 2020, Apple offered Bhakta a job as a Digital Ad  
28 Tech/Operations Manager. A graduate of Colgate University, Bhakta has years of experience in

1 the creation, management, monitoring, and analysis of digital ad campaigns. His past employers  
2 include Hulu, Merkle, and AOL. His past clients include Disney, Facebook, Target, Warner  
3 Brothers, and Amazon. Apple hired Bhakta because of his experience, skill, knowledge,  
4 network, and expertise.

5 28. Apple designated Bhakta's offer letter, which includes information about  
6 Bhakta's working conditions and wages, as "Apple Confidential." On information and belief,  
7 Apple uses a standard offer letter, which requires, as a condition of employment, that Apple  
8 employees sign Apple's Intellectual Property Agreement (IPA) and agree to comply with the  
9 terms of Apple's Business Conduct Policy. Apple routinely stamps its offer letters "Apple  
10 Confidential." On information and belief, these documents are boilerplate documents used on a  
11 widespread basis throughout the company.

12 29. As a condition of employment, the offer letter further required Bhakta to sign  
13 Apple's Intellectual Property Agreement (IPA) and agree to comply with the terms of Apple's  
14 Business Conduct Policy. Bhakta, as a condition of working for Apple, signed the offer letter  
15 and the IPA.

16 30. Apple's offer to Bhakta detailed information about his own wages and Apple's  
17 working conditions. It said his compensation would likely include an RSU award that was  
18 subject to the terms and conditions of Apple's Employee Stock Plan and RSU award agreement.  
19 It said his employment was conditioned upon, among other things, Bhakta's written agreement to  
20 (1) the terms of the offer letter, (2) Apple's Intellectual Property Agreement (IPA); and (2) the  
21 terms of Apple's Business Conduct Policy (BCP).

22 31. On or around July 15, 2020, Bhakta signed the offer letter and IPA. These  
23 agreements remain in full force and effect. Bhakta has also completed, reviewed, and certified --  
24 through annual Business Conduct training -- his acknowledgement and agreement to the BCP.

25 32. As further detailed below, Apple's standard offer letter, IPA, BCP, and equity  
26 plans and agreements place unlawful restraints on employee speech, competition, wage rights,  
27 autonomy, and privacy.

28

1 **II. Apple’s Speech Suppression Policies Are Evident in Multiple Documents and**  
2 **Through Various Actions Taken by the Company**

3 33. Apple seeks – through confidentiality designations, employee agreements,  
4 policies, threats, directives, requirements, and other practices – to monopolize information *about*  
5 or *related to* Apple, including information about Apple wages, working conditions, illegal  
6 conduct, or public policy. Examples of this conduct include the following.

7 **II.A. Apple’s Intellectual Property Agreement (“IPA”)**

8 34. As noted above, on or around July 15, 2020, Bhakta signed Apple’s Intellectual  
9 Property Agreement. The IPA violates California’s anti-gag rule and contains other unlawful  
10 restraints on activity.

11 **II.A.1. Information Restraints**

12 35. The IPA prohibits employees “during or after employment, from using or  
13 disclosing, or permitting any other person or entity to use or disclose, any Proprietary  
14 Information without the written consent of Apple, except as necessary to perform duties as an  
15 Apple employee.”

16 36. The IPA defines Apple’s “Proprietary Information,” as “all information not  
17 generally known outside Apple and/or kept confidential by Apple including for example but not  
18 limited to” “information relating to the business operations or affairs of Apple or persons or  
19 companies dealing with Apple” as well as “the employment and personnel information of Apple,  
20 such as compensation, training, recruiting, and other human resource information.”

21 37. The IPA does not include appropriate carve-outs for protected activity. It does  
22 not permit the disclosure of information about unlawful conduct, disclosures to the SEC, or the  
23 notice of immunity required by the Defends Trade Secret Act.

24 38. The IPA requires, upon termination of employment, that employees return – “all  
25 documents and materials of any kind pertaining to [his] work at Apple,” *and* “any documents,  
26 materials, or copies thereof, whether on paper or any other medium, containing any Proprietary  
27 information.”

28 39. The above prohibitions, by their plain terms, prohibit the disclosure or use of  
information about wages, working conditions, an employee’s general knowledge, skills, and

1 experience learned through their Apple employment, information available to others through  
2 normal competitive means, and reasonably suspected illegal conduct.

### 3 **II.A.2. Other Restraints of Trade**

4 40. The IPA also prohibits solicitation. It provides, “to the fullest extent permitted by  
5 applicable law, during your employment and for a period of one (1) year following your  
6 termination” “you will not, directly or indirectly, on your own behalf or on behalf of any person  
7 or entity, solicit, recruit, or take any action intended to induce Apple employees or contractors to  
8 terminate their relationship with Apple.”

9 41. The IPA requires employees to agree that they will not “plan or engage” in any  
10 activity competitive with or related to Apple’s business or products or engage in any other  
11 activities that conflict with any “employment obligations” to Apple.

12 42. The IPA assigns to Apple ownership of all “inventions,” including ideas and  
13 materials “made, created, or reduced to practice” by employees if the “invention” was: (1)  
14 developed using any Apple equipment; (2) “suggested” by work performed while at Apple; or  
15 (3) “conceived” during employment with Apple and related to any aspect of any past, present, or  
16 future Apple business or product. The IPA further requires employees to assign to Apple -- for  
17 free and for forever - the rights to all inventions that would otherwise belong to them and to  
18 waive any personal rights to such inventions both during and after their termination from  
19 employment with Apple.

20 43. On information and belief, Apple requires all of its California employees to sign a  
21 form IPA substantially similar to the IPA signed by Bhakta. Bhakta remains subject to the terms  
22 of the IPA.

### 23 **II.B. Apple’s Business Conduct Policy (“BCP”)**

24 44. Apple’s BCP also contains unlawful restraints on employee activity.

25 45. The BCP expressly provides, “You should never share a coworker or prospective  
26 employee’s personal information. This includes information regarding their employment history,  
27 personal contact information, *compensation*, health information, or performance and disciplinary  
28 matters.”

1           46.     The BCP provides that employees should, “[n]ever disclose confidential,  
2 operational, financial, trade-secret, *or other business information* without verifying with your  
3 manager whether such disclosure is appropriate.”

4           47.     The BCP prohibits employees from public or outside speaking engagements that  
5 relate to Apple’s business without Apple’s approval.

6           48.     The BCP requires employees to refer all inquiries from the media, industry, or  
7 financial analyst community to Apple’s Corporate Communications or Investor Relations.

8           49.     The BCP prohibits employees from contributing material to publications  
9 (including blogs) that relate to Apple’s business or products, or that “could be seen as a conflict  
10 of interest,” without Apple’s approval.

11          50.     The BCP prohibits employees from engaging in any activity that “may damage  
12 Apple’s reputation” or “gives the appearance of impropriety or divided loyalty.”

13          51.     The BCP prohibits employees from engaging in any “outside activity” that *could*  
14 have an adverse on their ability to perform their duties at Apple.

15          52.     The BCP prohibits employees from using Apple work time, equipment, or  
16 resources for political activities.

17          53.     The BCP prohibits employees from using time at work *or* Apple’s workspaces,  
18 phones, computers, internet access *or* any Apple assets or services, for any “outside activity”  
19 (meaning non-work activity).

20          54.     The BCP asserts that Apple “owns” all records and information in any form that is  
21 created or received during the course of doing Apple’s business. It also asserts that Apple  
22 “owns” its employees’ personnel records.

23          55.     Apple’s BCP applies to all full and part-time employees of Apple and its  
24 subsidiaries.

25           **II.C. Apple’s Security Policies**

26          56.     Apple’s Security and Information Classification Policies and Standards further  
27 evidence Apple’s restraints on employee speech and activity. Apple classifies information – not  
28 on the basis of any positive law (e.g. privacy or trade secrets) – but rather “based upon the

1 impact that an event compromising the security, integrity, or availability of the information  
2 [would have] on Apple’s operations, performance, brand, or regulatory/legal obligations.” Put  
3 more plainly, Apple classifies information based on how bad it thinks disclosure would be for  
4 Apple. There are four classification tiers: Prohibited (Tier 0), Highly Confidential (Tier 1),  
5 Confidential (Tier 2), Internal (Tier 3), and Public (Tier 4).

6 57. Apple defines information about wages, benefits, job titles, work performance,  
7 employment dates, employment status, and reporting relations as Confidential, Highly  
8 Confidential, or Prohibited. Even “Internal” information at Apple is restricted to users with a  
9 business need. According to Apple’s classification standards, Public (Tier 4) Information is  
10 limited to “Information that may be broadly distributed *without causing damage to Apple.*”

#### 11 **II.D. Apple’s Enforcement Practices**

12 58. Apple implements and enforces its unlawful agreements, policies, and practices  
13 through the designation of information, the surveillance and interrogation of employees,  
14 dedicated security and policy teams, management directives, and the discipline and termination  
15 of employees. Among other things:

16 59. On information and belief, in 2018, Apple issued a memo threatening Apple  
17 employees with termination or criminal consequences if they leaked information. The memo  
18 warned employees that it had caught 29 leakers in the previous year, and that 12 were arrested.  
19 The memo also warned Apple employees to be wary of press, analysts, and bloggers who may  
20 target or befriend them on social media.

21 60. On information and belief, in 2021, Apple refused a shareholder request to add  
22 the following language in their employment agreements: “Nothing in this agreement prevents  
23 you from discussing or disclosing information about unlawful acts in the workplace, such as  
24 harassment or discrimination or any other conduct that you have reason to believe is unlawful.”  
25 (This language is required by Government Code § 12964.5.)

26 61. Apple responded to other employee discussions about wages, working  
27 conditions, and suspected unlawful corporate conduct with warnings, terminations, and  
28 crackdowns intended to restrain employee speech.



1           **II.E. Bhakta’s Experience**

2           62. Bhakta’s personal experience with Apple confirms its written instruments –  
3 including the IPA, BCP, and Apple’s security policies – violate California law. In accordance  
4 with Apple’s policy, he asked for permission to engage in public speaking about his area of  
5 expertise: Digital Advertising. Apple forbade it. Apple also required that he remove and edit  
6 unprotected information about his working conditions and work at Apple from his LinkedIn  
7 profile. The limited his visibility and attractiveness in the job market, thus harming both Bhakta  
8 and competitors for Bhakta’s services.

9           63. *Privacy* in speech is a necessary condition of *free* speech. Apple’s surveillance  
10 policies and practices chill, and thus also unlawfully restrain, employee whistleblowing,  
11 competition, freedom of employee movement in the job market, and freedom of speech, all in  
12 violation of California’s employee anti-gag rule. These surveillance policies violate other laws  
13 as well.

14           **III. Apple Invades Its Employees’ Privacy and Compels Their Patronage**

15           64. In marketing materials, Apple declares that it respects human rights, including the  
16 right to privacy. Apple does not extend this respect to its own employees. Instead, Apple  
17 subjects its employees to surveillance and forces their patronage through the monetization of  
18 employee personal data as a condition of their employment.

19           **III.A. Apple’s Collection and Use of The Privacies of Life**

20           65. “Modern cell phones are not just another technological convenience. With all  
21 they contain, and all they may reveal, they hold for many Americans ‘the privacies of life.’”  
22 *Riley v. California* (2014) 573 U.S. 373, 403. As Chief Justice Roberts further explains in *Riley*:

23           66. “The storage capacity of cell phones has several interrelated consequences for  
24 privacy. First, a cell phone collects in one place many distinct types of information—an address,  
25 a note, a prescription, a bank statement, a video—that reveal much more in combination than any  
26 isolated record. Second, a cell phone's capacity allows even just one type of information to  
27 convey far more than previously possible. The sum of an individual's private life can be  
28 reconstructed through a thousand photographs labeled with dates, locations, and descriptions; the

1 same cannot be said of a photograph or two of loved ones tucked into a wallet. Third, the data on  
2 a phone can date back to the purchase of the phone, or even earlier. A person might carry in his  
3 pocket a slip of paper reminding him to call Mr. Jones; he would not carry a record of all his  
4 communications with Mr. Jones for the past several months, as would routinely be kept on a  
5 phone.”

6 67. “Although the data stored on a cell phone is distinguished from physical records  
7 by quantity alone, certain types of data are also qualitatively different. An Internet search and  
8 browsing history, for example, can be found on an Internet-enabled phone and could reveal an  
9 individual's private interests or concerns—perhaps a search for certain symptoms of disease,  
10 coupled with frequent visits to WebMD. Data on a cell phone can also reveal where a person has  
11 been. Historic location information is a standard feature on many smart phones and can  
12 reconstruct someone's specific movements down to the minute, not only around town but also  
13 within a particular building. . . . ‘GPS monitoring generates a precise, comprehensive record of a  
14 person's public movements that reflects a wealth of detail about her familial, political,  
15 professional, religious, and sexual associations.’”

16 68. “Mobile application software on a cell phone, or ‘apps,’ offer a range of tools for  
17 managing detailed information about all aspects of a person's life. There are apps for Democratic  
18 Party news and Republican Party news; apps for alcohol, drug, and gambling addictions; apps for  
19 sharing prayer requests; apps for tracking pregnancy symptoms; apps for planning your budget;  
20 apps for every conceivable hobby or pastime; apps for improving your romantic life. There are  
21 popular apps for buying or selling just about anything, and the records of such transactions may  
22 be accessible on the phone indefinitely. There are over a million apps available in each of the  
23 two major app stores; the phrase “there's an app for that” is now part of the popular lexicon. The  
24 average smart phone user has installed 33 apps, which together can form a revealing montage of  
25 the user's life.”

26 69. A “cell phone search would typically expose to [an employer] far *more* than the  
27 most exhaustive search of a house: A phone not only contains in digital form many sensitive  
28 records previously found in the home; it also contains a broad array of private information never

1 found in a home in any form – unless the phone is.”

2 70. In addition, the private data contained on an iPhone extends well beyond the  
3 user’s information. It extends to those with whom the user (or the iPhone) interacts. If a child  
4 texts his father that he prefers Batman to Spiderman, or a wife sends a racy date night calendar  
5 invite to her husband, then the child’s and the wife’s information is also contained on the iPhone.  
6 Indeed, personal data is collected by Apple even without any voluntary action by the user or the  
7 third party. For example, Apple’s FindMy and Journal apps rely on Bluetooth beacons and other  
8 technology to determine the proximity of Apple devices to one another. As Apple’s iCloud  
9 consumer agreement explains:

10 Apple and its partners and licensors may provide certain features  
11 or services that rely upon device-based location information using  
12 GPS (or similar technology, where available) and crowdsourced  
13 Wi-Fi access points and cell tower locations. To provide such  
14 features or services, where available, Apple and its partners and  
15 licensors must collect, use, transmit, process and maintain your  
16 location data, including but not limited to the geographic location  
17 of your device and information related to your Account and any  
18 devices registered thereunder, including but not limited to your  
19 Apple ID, device ID and name, and device type.

20 71. The personal data contained on an iPhone or other digital devices is more than  
21 private. It is also valuable. Personal data is the fuel of surveillance capitalism. As explained by  
22 Professor Ermita Shoshanna Zuboff: “Forget the cliché that if it’s free, ‘You are the product.’  
23 You are not product; you are the abandoned carcass. The “product” derives from the surplus that  
24 is ripped from your life.” *See, S. Zuboff, The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a*  
25 *Human Future at the New Frontier of Power* (Profile Books 2018).

26 72. Apple, like other surveillance capitalists, commodifies the human experience –  
27 including the nonwork aspects of its employees’ lives – and uses it for business purposes.

28 73. In order to use an Apple device, an individual must enter into a variety of  
agreements with Apple, including software licensing agreements. Personal data is part (or  
sometimes all) of the consideration an individual pays to become or remain an Apple consumer.  
Like all surveillance capital firms, Apple collects and uses this personal data – including the

1 Private Life Data of its own employees – for business purposes. These purposes include to  
2 “power its services” (e.g., improve its offerings or data analysis), “security and fraud prevention  
3 (e.g., to protect Apple), and to “personalize” Apple’s services (e.g., to sell businesses, and/or  
4 serve consumers, with targeted advertisements).

### 5 **III.B. Apple Owned vs Apple Managed**

6 74. Apple employees must be reachable for work and have access to Apple’s network  
7 while on and off duty. Apple also requires its employees to use only Apple devices for work.  
8 To satisfy these two requirements, employees must enter into consumer agreements with Apple  
9 and must carry an iPhone or other Apple device on their person. This condition of employment –  
10 particularly in combination with other Apple policies, practices, and requirements – has profound  
11 implications for their individual privacy, the privacy of their loved ones, and their individual  
12 autonomy.

13 75. Absent an exception, Apple places limits on the use of an “Apple-owned” iPhone  
14 for personal reasons. By Apple’s design, most employees instead use a personal iPhone for work  
15 reasons. In order to do so, Apple requires the employee to consent to Apple installing software,  
16 including an “electronic sim card” (eSIM) and/or a Virtual Private Network (VPN), on the  
17 personal device. Apple converts the personal device into an “Apple-managed” device.

18 76. Apple then claims the right to access, search and use all the Private Life Data  
19 contained on the Apple devices Apple compels its employees to use. As Apple’s iCloud@Apple  
20 policy explains:

21 any data stored on an Apple-managed or Apple-owned device is  
22 accessible by Apple in the event of a security search of the device,  
23 or in the event your data is included in a corporate backup service.  
24 *This means that if you use your personal account on an Apple-*  
25 *managed or Apple-owned iPhone, iPad, or computer, any data*  
*stored on the device (including emails, photos, videos, notes, and*  
*more), are subject to search by Apple.*

26 77. Apple’s Technology Asset Management Policy further requires that it know the  
27 “logical (e.g., IP address) and physical attributes (e.g., geographic location)” of every Apple-  
28 owned or managed device at all times. Consistent with this policy, Apple employees cannot

1 disable the Apple surveillance apps on their Apple owned or managed devices. If – as required –  
2 an Apple employee has physical possession of an Apple device, then Apple knows where they  
3 are.

### 4 **III.C. iCloud@Apple**

5 78. Apple also requires its employees to use Apple’s collaboration tools to perform  
6 their work (e.g., Apple email, Pages, Numbers, and Keynote). These tools in turn require an  
7 iCloud account. Apple thus requires its employees to use an iCloud account – and enter into or  
8 continue with an iCloud consumer agreement – as a condition of employment. Apple does not  
9 reimburse its employees for its use of their personal iCloud account.

10 79. Apple only allows one primary iCloud account per device. Thus, employees who  
11 use their *personal* phone for work are required to associate their *personal* iCloud with their work  
12 account. The personal iCloud account, like the personal iPhone, also becomes “Apple  
13 managed.” Upon making this association, Apple makes unilateral configuration changes to the  
14 personal iCloud account. For example, it unilaterally adds a “work folder.” Apple actively  
15 discourages the use of a work-only iCloud account even for those employees who use an Apple  
16 owned device.

17 80. The Private Life Data accessible through an iCloud account can easily dwarf the  
18 Private Life Data contained on a single device. The iCloud can include all the information  
19 gathered by all the synched devices, including family member devices and including non-Apple  
20 devices. This data can include email, contacts, reminders, entire photo libraries, internet  
21 browsing data, health data, messages, “smart home” data, passwords, apps, files, documents  
22 calendars, notes, and backups.

23 81. One Apple policy claims that Apple will not access or use the Private Life Data in  
24 its employees’ personal iCloud account, *except* as provided in other instruments like the iCloud  
25 consumer agreement and Employee Privacy Notice. This is deceptive and does not lessen the  
26 privacy invasion. The other instruments, including the iCloud consumer agreement, already  
27 grant Apple an unfettered right to access, use, preserve, prescreen, move, modify, disclose, or  
28 remove any and all content that is generated or encountered through use of the iCloud service.

1 Apple also declares the right to access, search, and use the Private Life Data on the Apple owned  
2 or managed [personal] devices *synced* with the personal iCloud account, and the syncing of  
3 devices is a primary purpose of an iCloud account.

#### 4 **III.D. Apple's Surveillance**

5 82. According to Apple's BCP, as a condition of initial and continuing employment,  
6 Apple's employees must agree that Apple can: (1) Access, search, monitor, and archive *all* data  
7 and messages sent, accessed, viewed, or stored (including those from iCloud, Messages, *or other*  
8 *personal accounts*); and (2) Conduct physical, video, or electronic surveillance, search [its  
9 employees'] workspace (e.g., file cabinets, desk drawers, and offices, even if locked), review  
10 phone records, or search any non-Apple property (e.g., backpacks, handbags) while on company  
11 premises. Apple's "Workplace Searches and Privacy" Policy goes further and suggests that  
12 Apple also has the right to search its employees' *home* offices.

13 83. Apple's message to employees – plainly described in its BCP – is unambiguous.  
14 Apple employees "should not have any expectation about the privacy of content or personal  
15 information on Apple systems or networks."

#### 16 **III.E. No Escape**

17 84. It is neither possible nor practical for Apple employees to avoid Apple's  
18 surveillance, collection, or use their Private Life Data. Among other things:

19 85. As one Apple document explains, some employees – e.g., those "who need to be  
20 able to 'live on' [Apple's] products with real personal data for testing or product development  
21 purposes" -- are required to either use their personal device for work or an Apple owned device  
22 for personal reasons.

23 86. Even if it was practicable for an employee to carry two smartphones at all times  
24 (e.g., an Apple owned device and a purely personal device), *they would still be carrying the*  
25 *Apple-owned device*. The Apple-owned device collects off-duty Private Life Data for Apple's  
26 use (e.g., location data) simply by being in the employee's possession.

27 87. As noted above, Apple declares the right to access, monitor, and use the data on  
28 purely personal devices and that employees should have no expectation of privacy in personal

1 information connected to an Apple system or network. *All* Apple devices, even purely personal  
2 ones, are connected to an Apple system or network.

3 88. The cost to employees of switching to a non-Apple device for purely personal  
4 reasons is too high. In its recent antitrust complaint against Apple, the United States of America  
5 and sixteen states, including California, allege the following: Apple has monopoly power in the  
6 smartphone market in the United States. Its market share exceeds 70%. Nearly 90% of iPhone  
7 users in the United States replace their iPhone with another iPhone. Apple's employees, even  
8 more so than Apple's consumers, are trapped in Apple's prison yard.

9 **III.F. Bhakta's Experience**

10 89. Consistent with the above, and upon beginning his employ, Apple gave Bhakta  
11 the "choice" of using either an Apple-owned or his personal iPhone for work. Bhakta used a  
12 personal phone and Apple installed an eSIM and VPN. Apple also required Bhakta to use his  
13 personal iCloud account to collaborate with his colleagues. Apple has not reimbursed Bhakta for  
14 its use of his iCloud account.

15 90. Apple, through the conduct described above and otherwise has compelled and  
16 coerced Bhakta to become and remain an Apple consumer. Apple required and requires that he  
17 patronize Apple, and that he pays for his job with his Private Life Data and personal iCloud  
18 account. Apple used, and continues to use, Bhakta's Private Life Data to further its business  
19 interests.

20 91. Apple, through the conduct described above and otherwise, has required Bhakta  
21 to waive his and his family's unwaivable privacies of life as a condition of initial and continued  
22 employment.

23 92. Apple, through the conduct described above and otherwise, has sought to control  
24 the nonwork aspects of his life.

25 93. On information and belief, all of Apple's California-based employees are subject  
26 to the same or substantially similar invasions of their rights.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **IV. Apple’s Illegal Clawback Policies and Practices**

2 **IV.A. Apple’s Forfeiture Provisions**

3 94. Apple also enforces its illegal Speech Suppression Policies through forfeiture  
4 provisions in its equity plans and agreements. For example, Apple pays certain employees with  
5 Restricted Stock Units (RSUs) that vest over time. The agreements and plans governing these  
6 RSUs, however, purport to permit Apple to claw back vested (meaning earned) RSUs – as well  
7 as any profit arising from their sale – if “during the Employment Period or any time thereafter,  
8 the [employee] has committed or engaged in a breach of confidentiality, or an unauthorized  
9 disclosure or use of inside information, customer lists, trade secrets, or other confidential  
10 information of the Company or any of its Subsidiaries.” As detailed above, the only information  
11 about Apple that Apple does not consider confidential is “information that may be broadly  
12 distributed *without causing damage to Apple.*”

13 95. The illegal forfeiture provisions in Apple’s equity plans and agreements are not  
14 limited to violations of Apple’s Speech Suppression Policies. Apple’s agreements assert it can  
15 claw back vested RSUs for other reasons as well, including a “material breach of *any* agreement  
16 to which the [employee] is a party with the Company or any of its Subsidiaries.” This includes,  
17 by its plain language, the many consumer agreements between employees and Apple.

18 **IV.B. Bhakta’s Experience**

19 96. Bhakta, like most other Apple employees, is paid compensation in the form of  
20 equity. Apple has thus repeatedly required him to sign equity agreements with illegal forfeiture  
21 provisions.

22 **V. Apple’s “Carveout” Provisions**

23 97. Certain of Apple’s agreements and policies contain carveouts for some employee  
24 speech. For example, the IPA includes a footnote which provides, “Nothing in this Agreement  
25 restricts your rights to speak freely about your wages, hours, and working conditions.” This  
26 carveout is legally inadequate because: (1) it is limited to “speak[ing],” which strongly implies  
27 that employees are permitted to orally communicate but prohibited from communicating in other  
28 forms (e.g., sharing documents or writing); (2) it is limited to “your” information, which strongly



1 implies that employees are prohibiting from discussing or disclosing *others*’ information; (3) it is  
2 buried in the IPA, as the definition of Proprietary Information is on the first page of the IPA,  
3 whereas the footnote is on the sixth and final page; (4) it is contradicted by the IPA (which  
4 expressly defines information about compensation as “confidential,” as well as the offer letter  
5 which is also classified as “confidential; (5) the carveout is limited to the terms of the IPA, but  
6 other Apple agreements, policies, and standards (including its security policies and standards)  
7 plainly prohibit such speech; and (6) any ambiguity created by the carveouts also has the purpose  
8 and effect of restraining employee rights.

9 98. Apple’s occasional and inadequate carveouts and disclaimers do not save Apple’s  
10 illegal policies or practices.

11 **VI. Administrative Exhaustion**

12 99. Plaintiff provided written notice to the LWDA on April 29, 2024 by online filing  
13 and to Defendants via certified mail on May 1, 2024 of the facts, legal claims and theories of  
14 their claims in this case. The LWDA did not respond to the letter. Based on these allegations  
15 and others, Plaintiff asserts all separate and distinct causes of action described in the following  
16 claims.

17 100. To the extent any of the facts, claims, or theories alleged in this Complaint are not  
18 encompassed by the April 29, 2024 notice, Plaintiff identifies them here for informational  
19 purposes only. Plaintiff will file an amended complaint after the exhaustion period of the PAGA  
20 notice filed contemporaneous with this Complaint has expired.

21 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
22 **Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698 et seq.**  
23 **Speech Suppression, Which Restrains Competition, Speech and Whistle Blowing**

24 101. Labor Code §§ 232(a) and (b) and 1197.5 prohibit actual or purported restraints  
25 on the disclosure of information about, or the discussion of, employee wages.

26 102. Labor Code § 232.5(a) and (b) prohibit actual or purported restraints on the  
27 disclosure of information about employer working conditions.  
28





1 aggrieved. Other aggrieved employees include those whose wages were actually clawed back  
2 (or who were faced with a clawback threat) in accordance with Apple's equity agreements and  
3 plans.

4 120. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, the State, and the aggrieved employees, seeks  
5 penalties as provided by the Labor Code. Plaintiff also seeks appropriate injunctive relief.

6 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

7 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff requests the following relief:

8 A. Civil penalties provided, per violation, in accordance with the California Private  
9 Attorneys General Act, California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*;

10 B. Prejudgment and post-judgment interest, as provided by law;

11 C. Attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1) and all other bases for fees  
12 in the Labor Code;

13 D. Costs of suit, including expert fees and costs;

14 E. A reasonable service award for Plaintiff for his service as a PAGA  
15 representative;

16 F. Injunctive relief; and

17 G. Such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

18 Dated: December 1, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

19  
20 By: 

21 Chris Baker (State Bar No. 181577)  
22 Deborah Schwartz (State Bar No. 208934)  
BAKER DOLINKO & SCHWARTZ, P.C.

23 Jahan C. Sagafi (State Bar No. 224887)  
24 Molly J. Frandsen (State Bar No. 320094)  
25 Hannah Meropol (State Bar No. 340095)  
OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP

26 *Attorneys for Plaintiff, on behalf of himself,*  
27 *other Aggrieved Employees, and for the State*  
28 *of California*