

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)  
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)  
Jeffrey M. Schwartz, Esq. (SBN 254916)  
**LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP**  
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200  
Beverly Hills, California 90211  
Telephone: (310) 432-0000  
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001  
Emails: [jlavi@lelawfirm.com](mailto:jlavi@lelawfirm.com)  
[vgranberry@lelawfirm.com](mailto:vgranberry@lelawfirm.com)  
[jschwartz@lelawfirm.com](mailto:jschwartz@lelawfirm.com)

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**  
Superior Court of California,  
County of Solano  
**07/22/2024 at 02:38:59 PM**  
By: E. DeRogatis, Deputy Clerk

**ASSIGNED TO  
JUDGE TIM P KAM  
FOR ALL PURPOSES**

Attorneys for Plaintiff RICQUEL BRUTON,  
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF SOLANO**

RICQUEL BRUTON, on behalf of herself and  
current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

CURO HEALTH SERVICES LLC; and DOES 1  
to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: CU24-05570

**PAGA ACTION**

**PLAINTIFF RICQUEL BRUTON'S  
COMPLAINT FOR:**

- CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT  
TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS  
GENERAL ACT OF 2004  
("PAGA"), LABOR CODE  
SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

**COMES NOW** Plaintiff RICQUEL BRUTON ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains on  
information and belief except as to those allegations relating to plaintiff herself, which are asserted  
on personal knowledge, against Defendants CURO HEALTH SERVICES LLC; and DOES 1 to  
100, inclusive (collectively "Defendants") as follows:

**I. INTRODUCTION**

- This is a Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*  
("PAGA") representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California, herself

1 and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-  
2 exempt employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated  
3 with Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all  
4 hours worked at the employees' minimum wage rate or overtime rate, failure to provide all legally  
5 required and legally compliant meal and rest periods, indemnification for all necessary  
6 expenditures or losses incurred by employees in direct consequence of discharging their duties,  
7 failure to timely pay earned wages during employment, failure to provide complete and accurate  
8 wage statements, failure to timely pay all unpaid wages following separation of employment.  
9 Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce  
10 Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section  
11 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

## 12 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and  
14 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks  
15 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly  
16 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of thirty-five thousand dollars  
17 (\$35,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-  
18 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former  
19 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout  
20 California, including but not limited to Solano County, at Vacaville, CA 95688.

## 21 **III. PARTIES**

22 3. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce  
23 Development Agency on behalf of herself and other current and former employees subject to  
24 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is  
25 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will  
26 work for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp  
27 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the  
28 currently named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was

1 employed by Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Solano County from  
2 approximately April 2018 until on or about November 17, 2023.

3 4. Defendant CURO HEALTH SERVICES LLC is authorized to do business within  
4 the State of California and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants  
5 DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant  
6 CURO HEALTH SERVICES LLC in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned  
7 illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant CURO HEALTH SERVICES LLC operates  
8 in Solano County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Solano County , including  
9 but not limited to, at Vacaville, CA 95688.

10 5. Defendants DOES 1 through 50 are corporations or other business entities or  
11 organizations of a nature unknown to Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California  
12 non-exempt employees, permitted Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised  
13 control over the wages, hours and working conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved  
14 employees.

15 6. Defendants DOES 51 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each  
16 Defendant is sued individually and in their capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner,  
17 representative, manager, supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant  
18 who violated or caused to be violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor  
19 Code and/or any provision of the Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours  
20 and days of work.

21 7. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100. Plaintiff  
22 sues said defendants by said fictitious names and will amend this complaint when the true names  
23 and capacities are ascertained or when such facts pertaining to liability are ascertained, or as  
24 permitted by law or by the Court. Each fictitiously named defendant is in some manner  
25 responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this complaint.

26 8. Plaintiff makes the allegations in this complaint without any admission that, as to  
27 any particular allegation, Plaintiff bears the burden of pleading, proving, or persuading and  
28 Plaintiff reserves all of Plaintiff's right to plead in the alternative.

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF  
2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

**(Against all Defendants by Plaintiff on behalf of Themselves, the State of California, and  
Other Current and Former Aggrieved Employees)**

9. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges each and every allegation contained in this pleading as though fully set forth herein.

10. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 2802, and the applicable Wage Orders.

11. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California Labor Code:

12. **Failure to pay wages for all hours worked at the legal minimum wage:** Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt employees. In California, an employer is required to pay hourly employees for all "hours worked," which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either directly or indirectly, performing services which inure to the benefit of the employer.

13. Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 require an employer to compensate employees for all "hours worked" at least at a minimum wage rate of pay as established by the IWC and the Wage Orders.

14. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more minutes per shift than Defendants credited them with having worked. Specifically, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages at the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to,

(a) Failure to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based

1 hourly non-exempt employees who worked on-call for the non-productive on-call hours worked  
2 despite the restrictive nature of Defendant's on-call policies, practices, and/or procedures.

3 (b) Failure to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
4 hourly non-exempt employees who worked remotely for the hours worked booting up their  
5 computers and securing logging into Defendant's VPN prior to clocking in for the start of their  
6 shift.

7 (c) Failure to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
8 hourly non-exempt employees who worked remotely for the hours outside of schedule spent  
9 troubleshooting with IT and responding to emails.

10 15. Therefore, Defendants suffered, permitted, and required Plaintiff and other current  
11 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to be subject to Defendants'  
12 control without paying wages for that time. This resulted in Plaintiff and other current and former  
13 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees working time for which they were not  
14 compensated any wages, in violation of Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 and the applicable  
15 Wage Order.

16 16. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay:**  
17 Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt  
18 employees. In California, an employer is required to pay hourly employees for all "hours worked,"  
19 which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the  
20 employee is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either  
21 directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to the benefit of the employer.

22 17. Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 require an employer to compensate employees a  
23 higher rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, in excess of forty  
24 (40) hours in a workweek, and on any seventh consecutive day of work in a workweek:

25  
26 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40)  
27 hours in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of  
28 work in any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-  
one-half (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve  
(12) hours in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular  
rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any

seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an employee. Labor Code § 510.

18. In this case, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees overtime wages for all overtime hours worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to,

(a) Failure to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees who worked on-call for the non-productive on-call hours worked despite the restrictive nature of Defendant's on-call policies, practices, and/or procedures.

(b) Failure to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees who worked remotely for the hours worked booting up their computers and securing logging into Defendant's VPN prior to clocking in for the start of their shift.

(c) Failure to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees who worked remotely for the hours outside of schedule spent troubleshooting with IT and responding to emails.

19. The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees were under the control of Defendants but were not compensated. To the extent that the foregoing uncompensated time occurred when Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday, more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendants failed to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code sections 510, 1194 and 1198, and the applicable Wage Order.

20. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant meal periods:** Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked shifts of more than five (5) hours in length and shifts of more than ten (10) hours in length.

21. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an

1 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of  
2 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the  
3 employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 4 at § 11;  
4 *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not  
5 employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the  
6 employee with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of  
7 the eleventh hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the  
8 meal period shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. A paid "on  
9 duty" meal period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from  
10 being relieved of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal  
11 periods.

12         22. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the  
13 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay  
14 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code  
15 §§ 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 4 at § 11.

16         23. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit legally required and compliant  
17 meal periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-  
18 exempt employees due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures, including but not  
19 limited to,

20                 (a) Failure to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved  
21 California-based hourly non-exempt employees who worked on-call during on-call hours worked  
22 despite the restrictive nature of Defendant's on-call policies, practices, and/or procedures.

23         24. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or  
24 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-  
25 based hourly non-exempt employees one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each  
26 workday that Plaintiff and/or other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-  
27 exempt employees did not receive legally required and compliant meal periods, in violation of  
28 Labor Code section 226.7.

1           25. Defendants' foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff  
2 and/or other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not  
3 receiving wages to compensate them for workdays during which Defendants did not provide them  
4 with meal periods in compliance with California law.

5           26. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**  
6 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant rest periods:** Plaintiff and other  
7 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked  
8 shifts of more than three-and-a-half (3.5) hours.

9           27. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest  
10 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor  
11 Code § 226.7; Wage Order 4 at § 12. Under California law, "[e]mployees are entitled to 10  
12 minutes' rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more  
13 than six hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so  
14 on." *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code  
15 § 226.7; Wage Order 4 at § 12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each  
16 work period. Wage Order 4 at § 12. Additionally, the rest period requirement "obligates employers  
17 to permit – and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods." *Augustus v. ABM Security*  
18 *Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve  
19 employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

20           28. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer  
21 must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday  
22 the employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code § 226.7; Wage  
23 Order 4 at § 12.

24           29. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit all legally required and  
25 compliant rest periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly  
26 non-exempt employees due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not  
27 limited to,

28           (a) Failure to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved

1 California-based hourly non-exempt employees who worked on-call during on-call hours worked  
2 despite the restrictive nature of Defendant's on-call policies, practices, and/or procedures.

3 30. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or  
4 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-  
5 based hourly non-exempt employees with one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each  
6 workday they did not receive legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor  
7 Code section 226.7.

8 31. Defendants' foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff  
9 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not  
10 receiving wages to compensate them for workdays in which Defendants did not provide them with  
11 rest periods in compliance with California law.

12 32. **Failure to Indemnify for Losses and Expenditures Incurred as Part of**  
13 **Employment:** California law requires that every employer must indemnify its employees for all  
14 necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in discharge of his or her duties or at  
15 the obedience of the directions of the employer. Moreover, an employer is prohibited from passing  
16 the ordinary business expenses and losses of the employer onto the employee. (Lab. Code, §  
17 2802.)

18 33. Defendants violated Labor Code Section 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiff and  
19 other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees' necessary  
20 expenditures they incurred in the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendants employed a  
21 policy, practice, and procedure included, but were not limited to, requiring Plaintiff and other  
22 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees who work remotely  
23 to use or purchase their own tools and/or resources in order to work for Defendants, including but  
24 not limited to their home internet, headset, and phone cases for work-related purposes - without  
25 reimbursing Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt  
26 employees for such costs.

27 34. Moreover, Defendants employed policies and procedures which ensured Plaintiff  
28 and aggrieved employees would not receive indemnification for their employment related

1 expenses. This practice resulted in Plaintiff and aggrieved employees not receiving such  
2 indemnification in compliance with California law.

3 35. Therefore, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for their  
4 employment related expenses, including but not limited to costs related to use of their personal  
5 cell phones and costs associated with their uniforms pursuant to Labor Code section 2802.

6 36. **Failure to timely pay earned wages during employment:** In California, wages  
7 must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the  
8 employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code § 204(a). Wages earned  
9 between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 16th  
10 and the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of  
11 any calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. *Id.* Other  
12 payroll periods such as those that are weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly, must be paid within  
13 seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period in which wages were earned.  
14 Labor Code § 204(d).

15 37. As a derivative of Plaintiff's claims above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed  
16 to timely pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt  
17 employees their earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium  
18 wages and/or rest period premium wages), in violation of Labor Code section 204. Defendants'  
19 aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in their failure to pay Plaintiff and  
20 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees their earned  
21 wages within the applicable time frames outlined in Labor Code section 204.

22 38. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section  
23 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated  
24 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage  
25 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including  
26 by failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and  
27 lawful sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7,  
28 246, 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by

1 Labor Code section 1198, Defendants secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while  
2 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

3  
4 39. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section  
5 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an  
6 employee his or her wages, the employer must “furnish each of his or her employees ... an  
7 itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the  
8 employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is  
9 exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of  
10 the Industrial Welfare Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable  
11 piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all  
12 deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5)  
13 net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the  
14 name of the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal  
15 entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and  
16 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

17 40. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff  
18 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages  
19 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest  
20 period premium wages) rendered Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-  
21 based hourly non-exempt employees’ wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code  
22 section 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

23 41. **Failure to pay employees all wages due at time of termination/resignation:** An  
24 employer is required to pay all unpaid wages timely after an employee’s employment ends. The  
25 wages are due immediately upon termination (Labor Code section 201) or within seventy-two (72)  
26 hours of resignation (Labor Code section 202).

27 42. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, because Defendants failed to pay  
28 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees  
all of their earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium

1 wages, and/or rest period premium wages), Defendants failed to pay those employees timely after  
2 each employee's termination and/or resignation, in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and  
3 203.

4 43. Labor Code sections 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g), authorize an aggrieved  
5 employee, on behalf of herself or herself and other current or former employees, to bring a civil  
6 action to recover civil penalties against all Defendants pursuant to the procedures specified in  
7 Labor Code section 2699.3.

8 44. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor  
9 Code section 2699.3. On May 17, 2024,, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and  
10 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of  
11 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the  
12 violations alleged.

13 45. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by  
14 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code  
15 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the  
16 parties notice within 65 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends  
17 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

18 46. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil  
19 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a),  
20 226.7, , 510, 512, and 1194, During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present,  
21 preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the  
22 following amounts:

23 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, and  
24 2802; one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial  
25 violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each  
26 subsequent violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

27 b. For violations of Labor Code section 226(a), alternatively, two hundred  
28 fifty dollars (\$250) for each employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and one

1 thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each subsequent violation, for each underpaid employee for each pay  
2 period [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 226.3].

3 c. For violations of Labor Code section 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50) for  
4 each employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for  
5 each subsequent violation, for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts  
6 established by Labor Code section 558].

7 d. For violations of Labor Code section 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for  
8 each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each  
9 subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, for each failure to pay each employee,  
10 plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code  
11 section 210].

12 e. For violations of Labor Code section 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for  
13 each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each  
14 subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, for each failure to pay each employee,  
15 plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code  
16 section 225.5].

17 47. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g), Plaintiff is entitled to an award of  
18 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with his/her claims for civil penalties.

19 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

20 **WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HERSELF AND ON OTHER**  
21 **AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:**

22 **ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:**

23 1. That Defendants be found to have violated the provisions of the Labor Code and  
24 the IWC Wages Orders as to the Plaintiff and aggrieved employees;

25 2. For any and all legally applicable penalties during the relevant statute of limitations  
26 subject to any permissible tolling, including but not limited to those recoverable under the  
27 California Labor Code, including but not limited to sections 210, 225.5, 226.3, 558, 2699(f);

28 3. For attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including but not limited to those recoverable

1 under California Labor Code section 2699(g); and

2  
3 4. For such and other further relief, in law and/or equity, as the Court deems just or  
4 appropriate.

5 Dated: July 22, 2024

6 Respectfully submitted,  
7 **LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP**

8 By:



9 Joseph Lavi, Esq.  
10 Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.  
11 Jeffrey M. Schwartz, Esq.  
12 Attorneys for Plaintiff RÍCQUEL BRUTON  
13 on behalf of herself and current and former  
14 aggrieved employees  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28