

Arman Marukyan (SBN 327150)
arman@calljustice.com
Krishna Rengan (SBN 357091)
krishna@calljustice.com
LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203
Tel: (818) 265-1020
Fax: (818) 265-1021

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
02/17/2026

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: R. Sanchez Deputy

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

AARON PANIZO, LUIS DELGADO,
individually, and on behalf of other
aggrieved employees pursuant to the
California Private Attorneys General Act;

Plaintiffs,

vs.

HOME DEPOT U.S.A., INC., a Delaware
corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 25TRCV04214

Honorable Alan B. Honeycutt
Department E

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR
ENFORCEMENT UNDER THE PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT,
CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 2698, ET
SEQ.**

Violation of California Labor Code §
2698, et seq. (California Labor Code
Private Attorneys General Act of 2004)

COMES NOW, Plaintiff AARON PANIZO (“Plaintiff PANIZO”) and LUIS DELGADO (“Plaintiff DELGADO”) (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), individually, and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act, and allege as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This representative action is brought pursuant to the California Labor Code section 2698, et seq. The civil penalties sought by Plaintiffs exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial. The “amount in controversy” for each named Plaintiff, including claims for compensatory damages, restitution, penalties, wages, premium pay, and pro rata share of attorneys’ fees, is less than seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000).

2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all other causes” except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

3. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief, Defendants are citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

4. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, each Defendant maintains offices, has agents, and/or transacts business in the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles. The majority of the acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees took place in the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff PANIZO is an individual residing in the State of California.

///

6. Plaintiff DELGADO is an individual residing in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

7. Defendant HOME DEPOT U.S.A., INC. at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles.

8. At all relevant times, HOME DEPOT U.S.A., INC. was the “employer” of Plaintiffs within the meaning of all applicable state laws and statutes.

9. At all times herein relevant, HOME DEPOT U.S.A., INC. and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, were the agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators, and assigns of each other, and were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators, and/or assigns, and all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization, and/or consent of each defendant designated as a DOE herein.

10. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual, or otherwise, of defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiffs who sue said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based on that information and belief, allege that each of the defendants designated as a DOE is legally responsible for the events and happenings referred to in this Complaint and unlawfully caused the injuries and damages to Plaintiffs as alleged in this Complaint. Plaintiffs will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to show the true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

11. HOME DEPOT U.S.A., INC. and DOES 1 through 100 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as “Defendants.”

12. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants, including the unknown defendants identified as DOES, directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved

employees so as to make each of said Defendants employers and employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

PAGA ALLEGATIONS

13. At all times herein set forth, California Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) was applicable to Plaintiffs’ employment by Defendants.

14. At all times herein set forth, PAGA provides that any provision of law under the California Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) for violations of the California Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of herself and other current or former employees pursuant to procedures outlined in California Labor Code section 2699.3.

15. Pursuant to PAGA, a civil action under PAGA may be brought by an “aggrieved employee,” who is any person that was employed by the alleged violator and against whom the alleged violations were committed.

16. Plaintiffs were employed by Defendants, and the alleged violations were committed against them during their time of employment, and they are, therefore, aggrieved employees. Plaintiffs and the other employees are “aggrieved employees” as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees of Defendants, and the alleged violations were committed against them.

17. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, an aggrieved employee, including Plaintiffs, may pursue a civil action arising under PAGA after the following requirements have been met:

- a. The aggrieved employee shall give written notice by online submission (hereinafter, “Employee’s Notice”) to the LWDA and by U.S. Certified Mail to the employer of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.

///

b. The LWDA shall provide notice (hereinafter, "LWDA Notice") to the employer and the aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not intend to investigate the alleged violations within sixty (60) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee's Notice. Upon receipt of the LWDA Notice, or if the LWDA Notice is not provided within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee's Notice, the aggrieved employee may commence a civil action pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699 to recover civil penalties, in addition to any other penalties to which the employee may be entitled.

18. On October 7, 2025, Plaintiff PANIZO provided written notice by online submission to the LWDA and by U.S. Certified Mail to Defendants HOME DEPOT U.S.A., INC. of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. Plaintiff PANIZO has not received an LWDA Notice within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the date of Plaintiff PANIZO's notice. Plaintiff PANIZO has not received any notice of Defendants' intention to cure the alleged violations.

19. On October 7, 2025, Plaintiff DELGADO provided written notice by online submission to the LWDA and by U.S. Certified Mail to Defendant HOME DEPOT U.S.A., INC. of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. Plaintiff DELGADO has not received an LWDA Notice within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the date of Plaintiff DELGADO's notice. Plaintiff DELGADO has not received any notice of Defendants' intention to cure the alleged violations.

20. On December 11, 2025, Plaintiff DELGADO provided amended written notice by online submission to the LWDA and by U.S. Certified Mail to Defendant HOME DEPOT U.S.A., INC. of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. Plaintiff DELGADO has not received an LWDA Notice within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the

1 date of Plaintiff DELGADO's notice. Plaintiff DELGADO has not received any notice of
2 Defendants' intention to cure the alleged violations.

3 21. Therefore, Plaintiffs have satisfied the administrative prerequisites under
4 California Labor Code section 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendants for
5 violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a),
6 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802.

7 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

8 22. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiffs and
9 other aggrieved hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked for any of the Defendants
10 in the State of California, including, but not limited to all current and former hourly-paid or
11 non-exempt employees who worked for any of the Defendants within the State of California
12 who earned shift differentials/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay
13 which was not used to calculate the correct regular rate of pay used to calculate the overtime
14 rate (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "other aggrieved employees").

15 23. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiff PANIZO as an hourly-
16 paid, non-exempt employee from approximately December 2022 to approximately January
17 2025 in the State of California.

18 24. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiff DELGADO as an
19 hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately April 2022 to approximately January
20 2025 in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

21 25. Defendants hired Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees and failed to
22 compensate them for all hours worked, missed meal periods, or missed rest breaks.

23 26. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiffs and the other
24 aggrieved employees, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiffs' and the other
25 aggrieved employees' employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

26 27. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of
27 Plaintiffs' and the other aggrieved employees' employment for them to be joint employers of
28 Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees.

28. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees.

29. Defendants continue to employ hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California.

30. Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees worked over eight (8) hours in a day and/or forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.

31. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants engaged in a uniform policy and systematic scheme of wage abuse against their hourly-paid or non-exempt employees. This scheme involved, *inter alia*, failing to pay them for all hours worked and for missed (short, late, interrupted, and altogether missed) meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law.

32. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation and that they were not receiving wages for overtime compensation.

33. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees the required rest and meal periods during the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Orders, and, thus, they are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

34. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiffs’ and the other aggrieved employees’ regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, and they did not receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiffs’ and the other aggrieved employees’ regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed.

35. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants

35. knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees

35. were entitled to receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of

35. pay at Plaintiffs' and the other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay when
35. a rest period was missed, and they did not receive all rest periods or payment
35. of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiffs' and the other aggrieved employees'
35. regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed.

36. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees were entitled
to receive at least minimum wages for compensation and that they were not receiving at least
minimum wages for all hours worked.

37. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees were entitled
to receive all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including overtime and
minimum wages and meal and rest period premiums, and they did not receive all such wages
owed to them at the time of their discharge.

38. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees were entitled
to receive all wages owed to them during their employment. Plaintiffs and the other
aggrieved employees did not receive payment of all wages, including overtime and minimum
wages and meal and rest period premiums, within any time permissible under California
Labor Code section 204.

39. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees were entitled
to receive complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but
they did not receive complete and accurate wage statements from Defendants. The
deficiencies included, *inter alia*, the failure to include the total number of hours worked by
Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees.

40. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
knew or should have known that Defendants had to keep complete and accurate payroll
records for Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with California law,

1 but they did not keep complete and accurate payroll records.

2 41. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
3 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees were entitled
4 to reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses and costs.

5 42. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
6 knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiffs and the other
7 aggrieved employees pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had the financial ability
8 to pay such compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so and
9 falsely represented to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees that they were properly
10 denied wages, all in order to increase Defendants' profits.

11 43. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay overtime wages
12 to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees. Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved
13 employees were required to work more than eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours
14 per week without overtime compensation.

15 44. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide
16 uninterrupted meal and rest periods to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees.

17 45. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and
18 the other aggrieved employees at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

19 46. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and
20 the other aggrieved employees all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation.

21 47. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and
22 the other aggrieved employees' wages within any time permissible under California law,
23 including, *inter alia*, California Labor Code section 204.

24 48. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide complete
25 and accurate wage statements to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees.

26 49. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to keep complete and
27 accurate payroll records for Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees.

28 50. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiffs

1 and the other aggrieved employees for necessary business-related expenses and costs.

2 51. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to properly
3 compensate Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees pursuant to California law in order
4 to increase Defendants' profits.

5 52. California Labor Code section 218 states that noting in Article 1 of the Labor
6 Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to "sue directly . . . for any wages or penalty
7 due to him [or her] under this article."

8 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **Violation of California Labor Code § 2698, et seq.**

10 **(Against HOME DEPOT U.S.A., INC., and DOES 1 through 100)**

11 53. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
12 through 52, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
13 forth herein.

14 54. PAGA expressly establishes that any provision of the California Labor Code,
15 which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA or any of its
16 departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees for a violation of the
17 California Labor Code, may be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved
18 employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees.

19 55. Whenever the LWDA or any of its departments, divisions, commissions,
20 boards, agencies, or employees has discretion to assess a civil penalty, a court in a civil
21 action is authorized to exercise the same discretion, subject to the same limitations and
22 conditions, to assess a civil penalty.

23 56. Plaintiffs and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are "aggrieved
24 employees" as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current
25 or former employees of Defendants, and the alleged violations were committed against them.

26 **Failure to Pay Overtime**

27 57. Defendants' failure to pay legally required overtime wages to Plaintiffs and

28 57. the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the IWC Wage Orders and

57. constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

58. Defendants' failure to provide legally required meal periods to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the IWC Wage Orders and constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

Failure to Provide Rest Periods

59. Defendants' failure to provide legally required rest periods to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the IWC Wage Orders and constitutes a violation of California Labor Code section 226.7.

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

60. Defendants' failure to pay legally required minimum wages to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the IWC Wage Orders and constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination

61. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees upon termination in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 and 202 constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

62. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees during employment in accordance with Labor Code section 204 constitutes a violation of California Labor Code section 204.

Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements

63. Defendants' failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with Labor Code section 226(a) constitutes a violation of California Labor Code section 226(a).

Failure to Keep Complete and Accurate Payroll Records

64. Defendants' failure to keep complete and accurate payroll records relating to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with California Labor Code

section 1174(d) constitutes a violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d).

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business-Related Expenses and Costs

65. Defendants' failure to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees for necessary business-related expenses and costs in accordance with California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.

66. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699, Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of all aggrieved employees, requests and is entitled to recover from Defendants and each of them, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.5, as well as all penalties pursuant to PAGA against Defendants, and each of them, including but not limited to:

- a. Penalties under California Labor Code section 2699(f) in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period or two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation where there has been a prior finding or determination that Defendants' policies or practices were unlawful or where Defendants' conduct was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive;
- b. Penalties under California Code of Regulations Title 8 section 11010, et seq. in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- c. Penalties under California Labor Code section 210 in addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the California Labor Code in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation; and
- d. Any and all additional penalties and sums as provided by the California

Labor Code and/or other statutes.

67. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(m), civil penalties recovered by aggrieved employees shall be distributed as follows: sixty-five percent (65%) to the LWDA for the enforcement of labor laws and education of employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities and thirty-five percent (35%) to the aggrieved employees.

68. Further, Plaintiffs are entitled to seek and recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210, 218.5, 2699, and any other applicable statute.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act, pray for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000):

As to the First Cause of Action

1. For civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558 and 2699(a), (f), (k), plus costs/expenses and attorneys' fees for violation of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802; and

2. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

DATED: February 17, 2026

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC

By: 
Arman Marukyan
Attorneys for Plaintiffs