Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
8/06/2026 1:12 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By A. Villchis-David, Deputy Clerk

Shaun Setareh (SBN 204514)
shaun@setarehlaw.com
SETAREH LAW GROUP
420 N. Camden Drive, Suite 100
Beverly Hills, California 90210
Telephone (310) 888-7771
Facsimile (310) 888-0109

Attorney for Plaintiff MINESH KUMAR

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

UNLIMITED JURISDICTION

MINESH KUMAR, on behalf of himself and all other aggrieved employees, and the general public,

Plaintiff,

v.

BLACKSTONE CONSULTING, a CALIFORNIA CORPORATION; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 26STCV24851

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

COMPLAINT

1. Civil Penalties (Lab. Code § 2698, *et seq.*)

Plaintiff MINESH KUMAR ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of himself and all other aggrieved employees, and the general public, complains and alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff brings this representative action against defendants BLACKSTONE CONSULTING, a CALIFORNIA CORPORATION; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, (collectively referred to as "Defendants") for alleged violations of the Labor Code. As set forth below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have

(1) failed to provide Plaintiff and all other similarly situated individuals with meal periods;

(2) failed to provide them with rest periods;

(3) failed to pay them premium wages for missed meal and/or rest periods;

(4) failed to pay them at least minimum wage for all hours worked;

(5) failed to pay them overtime wages at the correct rate;

(6) failed to pay them double time wages at the correct rate;

(7) failed to provide them with accurate written wage statements; and

(8) failed to pay them all of their final wages following separation of employment.

Based on these alleged violations, Plaintiff now brings this representative action to recover unpaid wages, restitution, civil penalties, and related relief on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, all other aggrieved employees, and the State of California.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction to hear this case because the unpaid wages, actual damages, liquidated damages, restitution, and penalties sought by Plaintiff from Defendants exceeds the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court of the State of California.

3. Venue is proper in COUNTY of LOS ANGELES pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §§ 395(a) and 395.5 in that liability arose there, because at least some of the transactions that are the subject matter of this Complaint occurred therein and/or each defendant is found, maintains offices, transacts business, and/or has an agent therein.

PARTIES

4. Plaintiff is and was, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, an individual residing in the State of California.

5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that Defendant BLACKSTONE CONSULTING, INC. is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a CALIFORNIA CORPORATION doing business in the State of California.

6. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE defendants when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants are responsible in some manner for the occurrences, acts and omissions alleged herein and that Plaintiff's alleged damages were proximately caused by these defendants, and each of them. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege both the true names and capacities of the DOE defendants when ascertained.

7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that, at all relevant times mentioned herein, some or all of the defendants were the representatives, agents, employees, partners, directors, associates, joint venturers, joint employers, principals, or co-participants of some or all of the other defendants, and, in doing the things alleged herein, were acting within the course and scope of such relationship and with the full knowledge, consent, and ratification by such other defendants.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

8. Plaintiff worked for Defendants as an hourly, non-exempt employee from approximately June 13, 2002 through February 10, 2026.

Off-the-Clock Work

9. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the putative class were not paid all wages earned as Defendants directed, permitted, or otherwise encouraged Plaintiff and the putative class to perform off-the-clock work.

10. Plaintiff regularly performed work off the clock for Defendants' benefit after he had clocked out for the day. Although Plaintiff was no longer on the clock, Defendants continued to

require him to perform essential job duties, including investigating vehicle thefts, monitoring the facility entrance, and retrieving and collecting surveillance footage related to security incidents. These duties were performed at Defendants' direction and were integral to Plaintiff's position and Defendants' business operations.

11. This off-the-clock work occurred regularly, at least once per week, throughout Plaintiff's employment. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff continued performing these work-related duties after he had clocked out, yet failed to compensate Plaintiff for all hours worked, including any applicable overtime pay.

12. Defendants were aware of this practice and directed, permitted, or otherwise encouraged Plaintiff and the putative class to perform off-the-clock work. As a result of Defendants' policies and practices, Plaintiff and the putative class were not paid for all hours worked.

Missed Meal Periods

13. Plaintiff and the putative class were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal period as part of each work shift; (2) chronically understaffing each work shift with not enough workers; (3) imposing so much work on each employee such that it made it unlikely that an employee would be able to take their breaks if they wanted to finish their work on time; and (4) no formal written meal and rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their meal and rest periods.

14. As a result of Defendants' policy, Plaintiff and the putative class were regularly not provided with uninterrupted meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hours worked due to complying with Defendants' productivity requirements that required Plaintiff and the putative class to work through their meal periods in order to complete their assignments on time.

Missed Rest Periods

15. Plaintiff and the putative class were not provided with rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1) Defendants'

policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift; (2) chronically understaffing each work shift with not enough workers; (3) imposing so much work on each employee such that it made it unlikely that an employee would be able to take their breaks if they wanted to finish their work on time; and (4) no formal written meal and rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their meal and rest periods.

16. As a result of Defendants' policy, Plaintiff and the putative class were regularly not provided with uninterrupted rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hours worked due to complying with Defendants' productivity requirements that required Plaintiff and the putative class to work through their rest periods in order to complete their assignments on time.

Wage Statements

17. Plaintiff and the putative class were not provided with accurate wage statements as mandated by law pursuant to Labor Code § 226.

18. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code 0167 226(a)(1) as "gross wages earned" were not accurately reflected in that all hours worked, including overtime and "off-the-clock" work were not included.

19. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(2) as "total hours worked by the employee" were not accurately reflected in that all hours worked, including overtime and "off-the-clock" work were not included.

20. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(5) as "net wages earned" were not accurately reflected in that all hours worked, including overtime and "off-the-clock" work were not included.

21. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(9) as "all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee" were not accurately reflected in that all hours worked, including overtime and "off-the-clock" work were not included.

///

///

///

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

CIVIL PENALTIES

(Lab. Code §§ 2698 *et seq*.)

22. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

23. During the applicable limitations period, Defendants have violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2802.

24. Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on behalf of himself and other current and former employees, to bring a representative civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures set forth in Labor Code § 2699.3 that may, but need not, be brought or maintained as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

25. Plaintiff, a former employee against whom Defendants committed one or more of the alleged Labor Code violations during the applicable limitations period, is an aggrieved employee within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699(c).

26. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code § 2699.3. Notice was provided to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and 65 days have elapsed without the LWDA providing Plaintiff with any notice of an intent to investigate.

27. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff seeks the following civil penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1198 and 2802:

i. For violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 212, 226.7, 227.3, 1194, 1198 and 2802, one hundred dollars ($100) for each employee per pay period for each initial violation and two hundred dollars ($200) for each employee per pay period for each subsequent violation (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2));

ii. For violations of Labor Code § 203, a penalty in an amount not exceeding thirty (30) days' pay as waiting time (penalties set by Labor Code § 256);

iii. For violations of Labor Code § 204, one hundred dollars ($100) for each

employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two hundred dollars ($200) for each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each initial violation that was either willful or intentional, and two hundred dollars ($200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the subsequent violation was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 210);

iv. For violations of Labor Code § 223, one hundred dollars ($100) for each employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two hundred dollars ($200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each initial violation that was either willful or intentional, and two hundred dollars ($200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the subsequent violation was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 225.5);

v. For violations of Labor Code § 226(a), if this action is deemed to be an initial citation, two hundred and fifty dollars ($250) for each employee for each violation. Alternatively, if an initial citation or its equivalent occurred before the filing of this action, one thousand dollars ($1,000) for each employee for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code § 226.3);

vi. For violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, fifty dollars ($50) for each employee for each initial pay period for which the employee was underpaid, and one hundred dollars ($100) for each employee for each subsequent pay period for which the employee was underpaid (penalties set by Labor Code § 558);

vii. For violations of Labor Code § 1197, one hundred dollars ($100) for each

aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1197 that was intentional and two hundred and fifty dollars ($250) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation of Labor Code § 1197, regardless of whether the initial violation was intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 1197.1);

viii. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g), Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with Plaintiff's claims for civil penalties.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, all other current and former non-exempt employees, and the general public, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

(1) Declaratory relief;

(2) Pre-judgment interest;

(3) Civil penalties;

(4) Costs of suit;

(5) Reasonable attorneys' fees; and

(6) Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: August 5, 2026

SETAREH LAW GROUP

/s/ Shaun Setareh
SHAUN SETAREH
Attorney for Plaintiff
MINESH KUMAR