

Assigned for all purposes to: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Officer: Christopher Lui

1 Matthew J. Matern (SBN 159798)
Email: mmatern@maternlawgroup.com
2 Tagore O. Subramaniam (SBN 280126)
Email: tagore@maternlawgroup.com
3 Sydney A. Adams (SBN 319991)
Email: sadams@maternlawgroup.com
4 **MATERN LAW GROUP, PC**
1230 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 200
5 Manhattan Beach, California 90266
Telephone: (310) 531-1900
6 Facsimile: (310) 531-1901

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff JUNIOR ARNULFO
MEJIA GONZALEZ individually, and on
8 behalf of all other aggrieved employees

9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

10 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

11 JUNIOR ARNULFO MEJIA GONZALEZ,
12 individually, and on behalf of other aggrieved
employees,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 GOTHIC GROUNDS MANAGEMENT, INC.
a corporation dba GOTHIC LANDSCAPE,
16 INC. – MAINTENANCE DIVISION; GOTHIC
LANDSCAPING, INC., a corporation;
17 GOTHIC LANDSCAPE, INC., an unknown
entity; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,
18

19 Defendants
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CASE NO.: **20STCV19664**

**COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF
THE CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT OF 2004**

[California Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.*]

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 PLAINTIFF JUNIOR ARNULFO MEJIA GONZALEZ (“PLAINTIFF”) individually and
2 on behalf of all other aggrieved employees, demanding a jury trial, hereby allege as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. PLAINTIFF brings this action on behalf of themselves and all other aggrieved
5 employees of Defendant GOTHIC GROUNDS MANAGEMENT, INC. a corporation dba
6 GOTHIC LANDSCAPE, INC. – MAINTENANCE DIVISION; GOTHIC LANDSCAPING, INC.,
7 a corporation; GOTHIC LANDSCAPE, INC., an unknown entity; (collectively, “EMPLOYERS”)
8 and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, (collectively, “DEFENDANTS”) to recover penalties arising
9 from unpaid wages earned and due, including but not limited to unpaid and illegally calculated
10 overtime compensation, illegal meal and rest period policies, failure to pay all wages due to
11 discharged or quitting employees, failure to maintain required records, failure to provide accurate
12 itemized wage statements, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to indemnify
13 employees for necessary expenditures and/or losses incurred in discharging their duties.

14 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15 1. The Superior Court of the State of California has jurisdiction in this matter because
16 PLAINTIFF is a resident of the State of California, and DEFENDANTS are qualified to do
17 business in California and regularly conduct business in California. Further, no federal question is at
18 issue because the claims are based solely on California law.

19 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district and the County of Los Angeles, California
20 because PLAINTIFF, and other persons similarly situated, performed work for DEFENDANTS
21 in the County of Los Angeles. DEFENDANTS maintain offices and facilities and transact
22 business in the County of Los Angeles, and because DEFENDANTS’ illegal payroll policies and
23 practices which are the subject of this action were applied, at least in part, to PLAINTIFF, and
24 other persons similarly situated, in the County of Los Angeles.

25 **PARTIES**

26 3. PLAINTIFF is a citizen and resident of the State of California. At times material
27 to this complaint, PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in the State of California as a
28 non-exempt employee

1 4. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DEFENDANT
2 GOTHIC GROUNDS MANAGEMENT, INC. dba GOTHIC LANDSCAPE, INC. –
3 MAINTENANCE DIVISION is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and
4 existing under the laws of the State of California. PLAINTIFF is further informed and believes,
5 and thereon alleges, that DEFENDANT GOTHIC GROUNDS MANAGEMENT, INC. is
6 authorized to conduct business in the State of California, and does conduct business in the State
7 of California. Specifically, DEFENDANT GOTHIC GROUNDS MANAGEMENT, INC.
8 maintains offices and facilities and conducts business in, and engages in illegal payroll practices
9 or policies in, the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

10 5. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DEFENDANT
11 GOTHIC LANDSCAPING, INC. is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized
12 and existing under the laws of the State of California. PLAINTIFF is further informed and
13 believes, and thereon alleges, that DEFENDANT GOTHIC LANDSCAPING, INC. is authorized
14 to conduct business in the State of California, and does conduct business in the State of
15 California. Specifically, DEFENDANT GOTHIC LANDSCAPING, INC. maintains offices and
16 facilities and conducts business in, and engages in illegal payroll practices or policies in, the
17 County of Los Angeles, State of California.

18 6. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DEFENDANT
19 GOTHIC LANDSCAPE, INC., is authorized to conduct business in the State of California, and
20 does conduct business in the State of California. Specifically, DEFENDANT GOTHIC
21 LANDSCAPE, INC. maintains offices and facilities and conducts business in, and engages in
22 illegal payroll practices or policies in, the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

23 7. The true names and capacities of DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are unknown to
24 PLAINTIFF at this time, and PLAINTIFF therefore sues such defendants under fictitious names.
25 PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each defendant designated as a
26 DOE is in some manner highly responsible for the occurrences alleged herein, and that
27 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees' injuries and damages, as alleged herein, were
28 proximately caused by the conduct of such DOE defendants. PLAINTIFF will seek leave of the

1 court to amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of such DOE defendants
2 when ascertained.

3 8. At all relevant times herein, DEFENDANTS were the joint employers of
4 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and
5 thereon alleges, that at all times material to this complaint DEFENDANTS were the alter egos,
6 divisions, affiliates, integrated enterprises, joint employers, subsidiaries, parents, principals,
7 related entities, co-conspirators, authorized agents, partners, joint venturers, and/or guarantors,
8 actual or ostensible, of each other. Each defendant was completely dominated by his, her, or its
9 co-defendant, and each was the alter ego of the other.

10 9. At all relevant times herein, PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees were
11 employed by DEFENDANTS under employment agreements that were partly written, partly oral,
12 and partly implied. In perpetrating the acts and omissions alleged herein, DEFENDANTS, and
13 each of them, acted pursuant to, and in furtherance of, their policies and practices of not paying
14 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees all wages earned and due, through methods and
15 schemes which include, but are not limited to, failing to pay overtime premiums; failing to
16 provide rest and meal periods; failing to properly maintain records; failing to provide accurate
17 itemized statements for each pay period; failing to timely pay wages during employment; failing
18 to properly compensate PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees for necessary expenditures;
19 and requiring, permitting or suffering the employees to work off the clock, in violation of the
20 California Labor Code ("Labor Code") and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission
21 ("IWC") Wage Order.

22 10. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that, that each and
23 every one of the acts and omissions alleged herein were performed by, and/or attributable to, all
24 DEFENDANTS, each acting as agents and/or employees, and/or under the direction and control
25 of, each of the other DEFENDANTS, and that said acts and failures to act were within the course
26 and scope of said agency, employment and/or direction and control.

27 11. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 558.1, DEFENDANTS and any person acting
28 on behalf of any of the DEFENDANTS, are liable for violating, or causing to violate, any

1 provision regulating minimum wages or hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial
2 Welfare Commission, or Labor Code §§ 203, 226, 226.7, 1193.6, 1194, or 2802.

3 **PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

4 12. Pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”),
5 Labor Code §§ 2698-2699.5, PLAINTIFF brings this action on behalf of themselves and all
6 current and former non-exempt aggrieved employees of DEFENDANTS in the State of California
7 at any time within the period beginning one (1) year and sixty five (65) days prior to the filing of
8 this action, and ending at the time this action settles or proceeds to final judgment (“PENALTY
9 PERIOD”).

10 13. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by online
11 filing on May 22, 2020 to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”)
12 and by certified mail to DEFENDANTS of the specific provisions of the Labor Code and IWC
13 Wage Orders alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged
14 violations. PLAINTIFF has not received any response from the LWDA. As PLAINTIFF has
15 waited more than sixty-five (65) days from the May 22, 2020 postmark date of PLAINTIFF’s
16 written notice before filing this action, PLAINTIFF has complied with all of the requirements set
17 forth in Labor Code § 2699.3 to commence a representative action under PAGA.

18 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

19 **Failure to Provide Required Meal Periods**

20 **[Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512; IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 11 and 16-2001, § 11]**

21 14. During the PENALTY PERIOD, as part of DEFENDANTS’ illegal policies and
22 practices to deprive their current and former non-exempt employees all wages earned and due,
23 DEFENDANTS required, suffered or permitted PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees to
24 take less than the 30-minute meal period, or to work through them, and have failed to otherwise
25 provide the required meal periods to PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees pursuant to
26 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and IWC Order No. 5-2001, § 11 and 16-2001, § 11.

27 15. DEFENDANTS further violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and IWC Wage
28 Order No. 5-2001, § 11 and 16-2001, § 11 by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and other

1 aggrieved employees who were not provided with a meal period, in accordance with the
2 applicable IWC Wage Order, one additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular
3 rate of pay for each workday that a meal period was not provided. Further, DEFENDANTS failed
4 to provide off duty meal periods by not relieving Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees of their
5 duties during their meal periods.

6 **Failure to Provide Required Rest Periods**

7 **[Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7; IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 12 and 16-2001, § 12]**

8 16. At all times relevant herein, as part of DEFENDANTS' illegal policies and
9 practices to deprive their current and former non-exempt employees all wages earned and due,
10 DEFENDANTS failed to provide rest periods to PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees as
11 required under Labor Code § 226.7, and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 12 and 16-2001, § 12.

12 17. DEFENDANTS further violated Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-
13 2001, § 12 and 16-2001, § 12 by failing to pay PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees who
14 were not provided with a rest period, in accordance with the applicable IWC Wage Order, one
15 additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that a
16 rest period was not provided.

17 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

18 **[Cal. Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198; IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 3 and 16-2001, § 3]**

19 18. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 3
20 and 16-2001, § 3, DEFENDANTS are required to compensate PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved
21 employees for all overtime, which is calculated at one and one-half (1 ½) times the regular rate of
22 pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week,
23 and for the first eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive workday, with double time for all
24 hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in any workday and for all hours worked in excess of
25 eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in any workweek.

26 19. PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees are current and former non-exempt
27 employees of DEFENDANTS entitled to the protections of Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194 and
28 IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 and 16-2001. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS

1 failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees for all overtime hours worked
2 as required under the foregoing provisions of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Order by, among
3 other things: failing to pay overtime at one and one-half (1 ½) or double the regular rate of pay as
4 provided by Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 3 and 16-2001, § 3;
5 requiring, suffering or permitting PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees to work off the
6 clock; requiring, permitting or suffering PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees to work
7 through meal breaks; illegally and inaccurately recording time in which PLAINTIFF and other
8 aggrieved employees worked; failing to properly maintain PLAINTIFF's and other aggrieved
9 employees' records; failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements to PLAINTIFF for each
10 pay period; and other methods to be discovered.

11 20. DEFENDANTS have knowingly and willfully refused to perform their obligations
12 to compensate PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees for all wages earned and all hours
13 worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194 and 1198 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 3
14 and 16-2001, § 3.

15 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

16 **[Cal Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197; IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 4 and 16-2001, § 4]**

17 21. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-
18 2001, § 4 and 16-2001, § 4, payment to an employee of less than the applicable minimum wage
19 for all hours worked in a payroll period is unlawful.

20 22. During the PENALTY PERIOD and in violation of California Labor Code §§
21 1194 and 1197 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 4 and 16-2001, § 4, DEFENDANTS failed to
22 pay PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees the applicable minimum wages for all hours
23 worked in a payroll period by, among other things: requiring, suffering or permitting PLAINTIFF
24 and other aggrieved employees to work off the clock; requiring, suffering or permitting
25 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees to work through meal breaks; illegally and
26 inaccurately recording time in which PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees worked; failing
27 to properly maintain PLAINTIFF's and other aggrieved employees' records; failing to provide
28 accurate itemized wage statements to PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees for each pay

1 period; and other methods to be discovered.

2 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment**

3 **[Cal. Labor Code § 204]**

4 23. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 204, for all labor performed between the 1st
5 and 15th days of any calendar month, DEFENDANTS are required to pay their nonexempt
6 employees between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed.
7 California Labor Code § 204 also provides that for all labor performed between the 16th and 26th
8 days of any calendar month, DEFENDANTS are required to pay their nonexempt employees
9 between the 1st and 10th day of the following calendar month. In addition, California Labor
10 Code § 204 provides that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be
11 paid no later than the payday of the next regular payroll period.

12 24. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS knowingly and willfully failed
13 to timely pay PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees all the wages for labor performed by
14 the next regular payroll period as required by California Labor Code § 204.

15 **Failure to Pay All Wages Due to Discharged and Quitting Employees**

16 **[Cal. Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203]**

17 25. Pursuant to Labor Code § 201, 202 and 203, DEFENDANTS are required to pay
18 all earned and unpaid wages to an employee who is discharged. Labor Code § 201 mandates that
19 if an employer discharges an employee, the employee's wages accrued and unpaid at the time of
20 discharge are due and payable immediately.

21 26. Furthermore, pursuant to Labor Code § 202, DEFENDANTS are required to pay
22 all accrued wages due to an employee no later than 72 hours after the employee quits his or her
23 employment, unless the employee provided 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to
24 quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or wages at the time of quitting.

25 27. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, in accordance
26 with Labor Code §§ 201 and 202, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the
27 employer is liable for waiting time penalties in the form of continued compensation to the
28 employee at the same rate for up to 30 workdays.

1 28. During the PENALTY PERIOD and in violation of Labor Code §§ 201 and 202,
2 DEFENDANTS willfully failed to timely pay accrued wages and other compensation to
3 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees who were discharged or quit his or her employment.

4 **Failure to Maintain Required Records**

5 **[Cal. Labor Code §§ 226(a), 1174(d); IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 7 and 16-2001, § 7]**

6 29. During the PENALTY PERIOD, as part of DEFENDANTS' illegal payroll
7 policies and practices to deprive PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees of all wages earned
8 and due, DEFENDANTS knowingly and intentionally failed to maintain records as required
9 under Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 1174(d) and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 7 and 16-2001, §
10 7, including but not limited to the following records: total daily hours worked by each employee;
11 applicable rates of pay; all deductions; meal periods; time records showing when each employee
12 begins and ends each work period; and accurate itemized statements.

13 **Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

14 **[Cal. Labor Code § 226(a); IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 7 and 16-2001, § 7]**

15 30. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS routinely failed and continue to
16 fail to provide PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees with timely and accurate itemized
17 wage statements in writing showing each employee's gross wages earned, total hours worked, the
18 number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-
19 rate basis, all deductions made, net wages earned, the inclusive dates of the period for which the
20 employee is paid, the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social
21 security number or employee identification number, the name and address of the legal entity or
22 entities employing PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees, and all applicable hourly rates in
23 effect during each pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate,
24 in violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 7 and 16-
25 2001, § 7.

26 31. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS knowingly and intentionally
27 failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees with timely and accurate itemized
28 wage statements in accordance with Labor Code § 226(a).

32. During the PENALTY PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees suffered injury as a result of DEFENDANTS' failure to provide timely and accurate itemized wage statements as PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees could not promptly and easily determine from the wage statement alone one or more of the following: the gross wages earned, the total hours worked, all deductions made, the net wages earned, the name and address of the legal entity or entities employing PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees, and/or all applicable hourly rates in effect during each pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

Failure to Indemnify Employees for Necessary Expenditures Incurred in Discharge of Duties

[Cal. Labor Code § 2802]

33. Labor Code § 2802(a) requires an employer to indemnify an employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of her his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

34. PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees were required to use their cell phone in the discharge of their duties, but were not reimbursed for these costs.

35. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed to indemnify PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees for all business expenses and/or losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties while working under the direction of DEFENDANTS, including but not limited to expenses for personal cell phone usage and other employment-related expenses, in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT

[Cal. Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.*]

(Against All DEFENDANTS)

36. PLAINTIFF incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 35.

37. PLAINTIFF is an “aggrieved employees” within the meaning of Labor Code §

1 2699(c), and proper representatives to bring a civil action on behalf of themselves and other
2 current and former non-exempt employees of DEFENDANTS pursuant to the procedures
3 specified in Labor Code § 2699.3, because PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS and
4 one or more of the alleged Labor Code violations was committed against PLAINTIFF during the
5 PENALTY PERIOD.

6 38. PLAINTIFF seeks to recover civil penalties through a representative action
7 permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46
8 Cal.4th 969. Thus, class certification is not required.

9 39. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2698-2699.5, PLAINTIFF seeks to recover civil
10 penalties from DEFENDANTS in a representative action for the violations set forth above,
11 including but not limited to violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510,
12 512, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2802.

13 40. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(a), PLAINTIFF seeks civil penalties for
14 DEFENDANTS' violations of Labor Code provisions for which a civil penalty is specifically
15 provided, including but not limited to the following:

16 a. Pursuant to Labor Code § 210, for violations of Labor Code § 204,
17 DEFENDANTS are subject to a civil penalty in the amount of one hundred
18 dollars (\$100) for the initial violation for each failure to pay each employee
19 and two hundred dollars (\$200) per employee for violations in subsequent
20 pay periods.

21 b. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3, for violations of Labor Code § 226(a),
22 DEFENDANTS are subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred
23 and fifty dollars (\$250) per aggrieved employee for the initial pay period
24 where a violation occurs and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per aggrieved
25 employee for violations in subsequent pay periods.

26 c. Pursuant to Labor Code § 558(a), "[a]ny employer or other person acting
27 on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section
28 of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any

1 order of the Industrial Welfare Commission,” including Labor Code §§ 510
2 and 512, shall be subject to a civil penalty, in addition to any other penalty
3 provided by law, of fifty dollars (\$50) for initial violations for each
4 underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was
5 underpaid and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each subsequent violation for
6 each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was
7 underpaid. In addition, PLAINTIFF seeks civil penalties in the amount
8 sufficient to recover unpaid wages owed to aggrieved employees pursuant
9 to Labor Code § 558(a).

10 d. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, for violations of Labor Code § 1174(d),
11 DEFENDANTS are subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars
12 (\$500).

13 e. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1, an employer who pays or causes to be
14 paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an order of
15 the commission, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: for any initial
16 violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars (\$100) for
17 each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is
18 underpaid; and for each subsequent violation of the same offense, two
19 hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay
20 period for which the employee is underpaid regardless of whether the
21 initial violation was intentionally committed.

22 41. Labor Code § 2699(f) provides that for all Labor Code violations for which a civil
23 penalty is not specifically provided, the following civil penalties are established: one hundred
24 dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two
25 hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.
26 PLAINTIFF seeks such civil penalties under Labor Code § 2699(f) for DEFENDANTS’
27 violations of Labor Code provisions for which a civil penalty is not specifically provided,
28 including but not limited to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226.7, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2802.

1 42. PLAINTIFF additionally seeks reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to
2 Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

3 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

4 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, individually and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees,
5 prays for relief against DEFENDANTS as follows:

6 1. For civil penalties according to proof, including but not limited to the amount of
7 any unpaid wages of PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees and all penalties authorized by
8 the Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699(a) and (f);

9 2. For interest at the legal rate pursuant to Labor Code §§ 218.6, 1194, 2802,
10 California Civil Code §§ 3287, 3288, and/or any other applicable provision providing for pre-
11 judgment interest;

12 3. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g) and/or
13 any other applicable provisions providing for attorney's fees and costs; and

14 4. For such further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

15
16 DATED: May 22, 2020

17 Respectfully submitted,

18 **MATERN LAW GROUP, PC**

19
20 By: 

21 Matthew J. Matern
22 Tagore O. Subramaniam
23 Sydney A. Adams
24 Attorneys for Plaintiff JUNIOR ARNULFO
25 MEJIA GONZALEZ individually, and on
26 behalf of others similarly situated
27
28

- 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

DATED: May 22, 2020

MATERN LAW GROUP, PC

[Handwritten signature]

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28