

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**

Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)

Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)

Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)

Nicholas J. De Blouw (State Bar #280922)

2255 Calle Clara

La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858)551-1223

Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Website: [www.bamlawca.com](http://www.bamlawca.com)

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

SHYLAINE ROBERTS, on behalf of the  
State of California, as a private attorney  
general,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SOLANTIC CORPORATION, a  
Corporation, and DOES 1 through 50,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 20NWCV00603

**THIRD AMENDED  
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION  
COMPLAINT FOR:**

1.Civil Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code §  
2699. *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code  
§§ 201. 202. 203. 204 *et seq.*, 210. 226(a).  
226.7. 233. 246. 248.5. 351. 510. 512.  
558(a)(1)(2). 1194. 1197. 1197.1. 1198.  
2802. California Code of Regulations. Title  
8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B).

1 Plaintiff Shylaine Roberts (“PLAINTIFF”) on behalf of the people of the State of  
2 California and as an “aggrieved employee” acting as a private attorney general under the Labor  
3 Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004, § 2699, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) only, alleges on  
4 information and belief, except for her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal  
5 knowledge, the following:

### 6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. PLAINTIFF brings this action against Defendant Solantic Corporation (referred  
8 to as “DEFENDANT”) seeking only to recover PAGA civil penalties for herself, and on behalf  
9 of all current and former aggrieved employees that worked for DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFF  
10 does **not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by California Labor**  
11 **Code § 2699.** To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for wage violations,  
12 PLAINTIFF does not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those violations, but  
13 simply the civil penalties permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.

14 2. California has enacted the PAGA to permit individuals to bring an action on  
15 behalf of herself and on behalf of others for PAGA penalties *only*, which is the precise and sole  
16 nature of this action.

17 3. Accordingly, PLAINTIFF seeks to obtain all applicable relief for  
18 DEFENDANT’s violations under PAGA and solely for the relief as permitted by PAGA – that  
19 is, penalties and any other relief the Court deems proper pursuant to the PAGA. Nothing in this  
20 complaint should be construed as attempting to obtain any relief that would not be available in  
21 a PAGA-only action.

### 22 **THE PARTIES**

23 4. Defendant Solantic Corporation (“DEFENDANT”) is a Corporation that at all  
24 relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in the  
25 state of California.

26 5. DEFENDANT has extensive experience in urgent care management and  
27 operations.  
28

1           6.     PLAINTIFF has been employed by DEFENDANT since November of 2016 and  
2 has been at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly  
3 basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and  
4 overtime wages due for all time worked.

5           7.     PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy  
6 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General  
7 Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to herself  
8 and all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and  
9 who were classified as non exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the  
10 time period of August 23, 2019 until April 30, 2021 (the "PAGA PERIOD").

11           8.     PLAINTIFF, on behalf of herself and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES presently  
12 or formerly employed by DEFENDANT during the PAGA PERIOD, brings this representative  
13 action pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* seeking fixed civil penalties for DEFENDANT's  
14 violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 233, 246,  
15 248.5, 351, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of  
16 Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s).  
17 Based upon the foregoing, PLAINTIFF and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are aggrieved  
18 employees within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*

19           9.     The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,  
20 partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently  
21 unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names pursuant  
22 to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege  
23 the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are ascertained.  
24 PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that  
25 the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are  
26 responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that proximately  
27 caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

28           10.    The agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants and each of them acting

1 on behalf of the Defendants acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as the  
2 agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendants, and personally participated in the conduct  
3 alleged herein on behalf of the Defendants with respect to the conduct alleged herein.  
4 Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants and  
5 all Defendants are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED  
6 EMPLOYEES, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants'  
7 agents, servants and/or employees.

### 8 9 THE CONDUCT

10 11. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT is  
11 required to pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all their time worked,  
12 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including  
13 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF  
14 and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work without paying them for all the time they are under  
15 DEFENDANT's control. From time to time, DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work  
16 while clocked out during what is supposed to be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break.  
17 PLAINTIFF is from time to time interrupted by work assignments. As a result, PLAINTIFF  
18 and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeit minimum wage and overtime compensation by  
19 from time to time working without their time being accurately recorded and without  
20 compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates. DEFENDANT's uniform  
21 policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time  
22 worked is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

23 12. State and federal law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-  
24 one-half times their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES  
25 were compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an  
26 employee's performance.

27 13. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES'  
28 compensation was DEFENDANT's non-discretionary incentive program that paid PLAINTIFF

1 and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incentive wages based on their performance for  
2 DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all employees paid on an  
3 hourly basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the various performance  
4 goals set by DEFENDANT. However, when calculating the regular rate of pay in order to pay  
5 overtime to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, DEFENDANT failed to  
6 include the incentive compensation as part of the employees' "regular rate of pay" for purposes  
7 of calculating overtime pay. Management and supervisors described the incentive program to  
8 potential and new employees as part of the compensation package. As a matter of law, the  
9 incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES must  
10 be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted in a underpayment of  
11 overtime compensation to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by  
12 DEFENDANT.

13 14. DEFENDANT further underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and other  
14 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay.  
15 Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES regularly earn  
16 non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, incentives, shift differential pay,  
17 and bonuses. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate of pay, DEFENDANT underpaid sick  
18 pay to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at their base rates of pay.

19 15. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and procedure,  
20 administered a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by Plaintiff  
21 and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that  
22 during the course of their employment, Plaintiff and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES  
23 were paid less than they would have been paid had they been paid for actual recorded time  
24 rather than "rounded" time. Plaintiff, on information and belief, allege that DEFENDANT'S  
25 rounding policy was neither fair nor neutral because Plaintiff the other AGGRIEVED  
26 EMPLOYEES did not gain time through the rounding policy. In addition, Plaintiff and the  
27 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not paid for time donning and doffing their Personal  
28 Protective Equipment ("PPE") gear because Plaintiff and the other AGGRIEVED

1 EMPLOYEES were not paid until they were wearing their company uniforms and PPE, at their  
2 assigned station, at their assigned start time and their paid work time ended at their scheduled  
3 shift end time, at which point Plaintiff and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were  
4 permitted to remove their uniforms and PPE and clock out. Plaintiff and the other  
5 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were prohibited from clocking in more than seven (7) minutes  
6 before their scheduled shift. As a result, Plaintiff and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES  
7 were not paid for their time donning and doffing as set forth above as their pay started and  
8 stopped immediately at their scheduled start and stop time.

9 16. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other  
10 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are also from time to time unable to take off duty  
11 meal breaks and are not fully relieved of duty for meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other  
12 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are from time to time required to perform work as ordered by  
13 DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal  
14 break. Further, DEFENDANT fails to provide PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES  
15 with a second off-duty meal period from time to time in which these employees are required by  
16 DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work from time to time. PLAINTIFF and the other  
17 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation  
18 and in accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy and practice.

19 17. During the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES  
20 are also required from time to time to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided  
21 ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees are denied their first rest periods of at  
22 least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours from time to  
23 time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of  
24 between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third rest period  
25 of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time.  
26 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are also not provided with one hour wages  
27 in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other  
28 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are from time to time denied their proper rest periods by

1 DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers. Additionally, the applicable California Wage  
2 Order requires employers to provide employees with off-duty rest periods, which the California  
3 Supreme Court defined as time during which an employee is relieved from all work related  
4 duties and free from employer control. In so doing, the Court held that the requirement under  
5 California law that employers authorize and permit all employees to take rest period means that  
6 employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees  
7 spend their time which includes control over the locations where employees may take their rest  
8 period. Employers cannot impose controls that prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk -  
9 five minutes out, five minutes back. Here, DEFENDANT's policy restricts PLAINTIFF and  
10 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES from unconstrained walks and requires these employees to  
11 remain on DEFENDANT's premises under DEFENDANT's control during what should be their  
12 paid, off duty rest periods.

13 18. DEFENDANT also fails to provide PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED  
14 EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other  
15 things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides that every  
16 employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage statement  
17 in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly rates in  
18 effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate.  
19 Specifically, DEFENDANT violated Section 226 by failing to identify the correct rates of pay  
20 and number of hours worked, including for the "Retro Pay," and "Worked Meal" items of pay,  
21 which are wage payments. In addition, whenever sick pay wages are underpaid to Plaintiff and  
22 the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, Defendant failed to furnish wage statements that  
23 accurately show and itemize applicable hourly rates for sick time taken. Aside, from the  
24 violations listed above, DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage  
25 statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226 *et seq.* As a result,  
26 DEFENDANT from time to time provided PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED  
27 EMPLOYEES with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

28 19. DEFENDANT intentionally and knowingly fails to reimburse and indemnify

1 PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for required business expenses  
2 incurred by PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in direct consequence of  
3 discharging their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section  
4 2802, employers are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course  
5 and scope of their employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall  
6 indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee  
7 in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the  
8 directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying  
9 the directions, believed them to be unlawful."

10 20. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED  
11 EMPLOYEES as a business expense, are required by DEFENDANT to use their own personal  
12 cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for  
13 DEFENDANT but are not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the cost associated  
14 with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT's benefit. Specifically,  
15 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are required by DEFENDANT to use their  
16 personal cellular phones to respond to managers while off the clock (which also results in  
17 minimum wage and overtime violations) and DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and other  
18 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to use their personal vehicles in furtherance of their job duties  
19 for DEFENDANT. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT,  
20 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred unreimbursed business expenses  
21 which included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cellular phones  
22 and personal vehicles all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

23 21. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the  
24 requirements of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order,  
25 DEFENDANT as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, intentionally, knowingly  
26 and systematically failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other Aggrieved Employees suitable  
27 seating when the nature of these employees' work reasonably permitted sitting.

28 22. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved



1 Employees were entitled to suitable seating and/or were entitled to sit when it did not interfere  
2 with the performance of their duties, and that DEFENDANT did not provide suitable seating  
3 and/or did not allow them to sit when it did not interfere with the performance of their duties.

4 23. By reason of this conduct applicable to PLAINTIFF and all Aggrieved  
5 Employees, DEFENDANT violated California Labor Code Section 1198 and California Code  
6 of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Wage Order 4-2001,  
7 Section 14 by failing to provide suitable seats. PLAINTIFF seeks penalties on behalf of  
8 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees as provided herein. Providing suitable seating is  
9 the DEFENDANT's burden. As a result of DEFENDANT's intentional disregard of the  
10 obligation to meet this burden, DEFENDANT violated the California Labor Code and  
11 regulations promulgated thereunder as herein alleged.

12 24. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the  
13 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT as  
14 a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, intentionally, knowingly and systematically  
15 failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for missed meal,  
16 rest periods, work performed off-the clock and sick pay at their regular rate of pay. This  
17 uniform policy and practice of DEFENDANT is intended to purposefully avoid the payment for  
18 all time worked as required by California law which allows DEFENDANT to illegally profit  
19 and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent  
20 equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES against  
21 DEFENDANT, the PAGA PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

22 25. By reason of this uniform conduct applicable to PLAINTIFF and all  
23 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, DEFENDANT engaged in a company-wide policy and procedure  
24 which fails to accurately calculate and record minimum, overtime, and sick wages due to  
25 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. The proper recording of these  
26 employees' missed meal and rest breaks is the DEFENDANT's burden. As a result of  
27 DEFENDANT's intentional disregard of the obligation to meet this burden, DEFENDANT fails  
28 to properly calculate and/or pay all required compensation for work performed by the

1 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and violated the California Labor Code and regulations  
2 promulgated thereunder as herein alleged.

3 26. All of the conduct and violations alleged herein occurred during the PAGA  
4 PERIOD. To the extent that any of the conduct and violations alleged herein did not affect  
5 PLAINTIFF during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF seeks penalties for those violations that  
6 affected other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES pursuant to *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.* 2018  
7 AJDAR 12157 (Certified for Publication 12/19/18).

8  
9 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

10 27. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil  
11 Procedure, Section 410.10.

12 28. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,  
13 Sections 395 and 395.5, because PLAINTIFF worked in this County for DEFENDANT, resides  
14 in this County, and DEFENDANT (i) currently maintains and at all relevant times maintained  
15 offices and facilities in this County and/or conducts substantial business in this County, and (ii)  
16 committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against PLAINTIFF and the  
17 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

18 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **For Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act**

20 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*]**

21 **(By PLAINTIFF and Against All Defendants)**

22 29. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set  
23 forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

24 30. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state  
25 labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of  
26 the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under  
27 PAGA is fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to  
28 benefit private parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution,

1 but to create a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the  
2 Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the  
3 public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover  
4 civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA  
5 claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

6 31. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy  
7 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General  
8 Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to herself  
9 and all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and  
10 who were classified as non exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the  
11 time period of August 23, 2019 until April 20, 2021 (the "PAGA PERIOD").

12 32. On June 18, 2020, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to the Labor  
13 and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the employer of  
14 the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code §  
15 2699.3. The statutory waiting period for PLAINTIFF to add these allegations to the Complaint  
16 has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may now commence a  
17 representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of  
18 California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

19 33. On January 27, 2021, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to the  
20 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the  
21 employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by  
22 Labor Code § 2699.3. The statutory waiting period for PLAINTIFF to add these allegations to  
23 the operative Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may  
24 now commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy  
25 of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

26 34. On September 18, 2025, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to the  
27 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the  
28 employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by

1 Labor Code § 2699.3. On January 30, 2026, PLAINTIFF gave amended written notice to the  
2 Agency, adding further specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been  
3 violated. The statutory waiting period for PLAINTIFF to add these allegations to the operative  
4 Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may pursue a  
5 representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of  
6 California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

7 35. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful  
8 business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failure to pay all wages due (including, but  
9 not limited to, claims for minimum wages, straight time wages, overtime, time-and-a-half,  
10 double time, miscalculation or underpayment of the regular rate, miscalculation or  
11 underpayment of meal and/or rest premiums, miscalculation or underpayment of sick time/sick  
12 pay, off-the-clock work, donning and doffing, rounding time, split shift, reporting time); (b)  
13 failure to provide, authorize or permit compliant meal periods or pay proper premiums in lieu  
14 thereof; (c) failure to provide, authorize or permit compliant rest breaks or pay proper premiums  
15 in lieu thereof; (d) failure to indemnify or reimburse for necessary business expenses, as a result  
16 of employment or in the consequence of performing required duties (including but not limited  
17 to, use of personal cell phones and personal vehicles); (e) failure to timely pay final wages at  
18 termination; (f) failure to timely pay wages during employment; (g) failure to provide accurate  
19 itemized wage statements; (h) failure to maintain accurate records; and (i) failure to provide  
20 suitable seating, all in violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §§  
21 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 226(a), 233, 246, 248.5, 226.7, 351, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2),  
22 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040,  
23 Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to civil penalties  
24 as a result of such conduct.<sup>1</sup> PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of only civil penalties as  
25 prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representative of the  
26 State of California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFF and the other

---

27  
28 <sup>1</sup>Plaintiff specifically excludes and/or does not allege any claims under California Labor  
Code §558(a)(3).

1 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

2  
3 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

4 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against each Defendant, jointly and  
5 severally, as follows:

6 1. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to all AGGRIEVED  
7 EMPLOYEES:

8 A) Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private  
9 Attorneys General Act of 2004; and,

10 B) An award of attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the  
11 law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §2699.

12  
13 Dated: March 25, 2026

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE  
BLOUW LLP

14  
15  
16 By: /s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw

17 Norman B. Blumenthal  
18 Nicholas J. De Blouw  
19 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28