

COPY

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203

Edwin Aiwarzian (SBN 232943)
LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203
Tel: (818) 265-1020 / Fax: (818) 265-1021

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**CONFORMED COPY
ORIGINAL FILED**
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

MAY 24 2021

Sherri B. Carter, Executive Office/Clerk
By: Maisha Pryor, Deputy
Maisha Pryor

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE**

FIDEL RIVERA, individually, and on behalf
of other members of the general public
similarly situated and on behalf of other
aggrieved employees pursuant to the
California Private Attorneys General Act;

Plaintiff,

vs.

BASMAT INC, d/b/a, MCSTARLITE
COMPANY, an unknown business entity;
and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 20STCV35714

Honorable William F. Highberger
Department 10

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

- (1) Violation of California Business &
Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.
- (2) Violation of California Labor
Code § 2698, et seq. (California
Labor Code Private Attorneys
General Act of 2004)

RECEIVED

MAY 24 2021

FILING WINDOW

COMES NOW, Plaintiff FIDEL RIVERA (“Plaintiff”), individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorney General Act, and alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This class action is brought pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial. The “amount in controversy” for the named Plaintiff, including but not limited to claims for restitution, penalties, 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 Defendant because, upon information and belief, Defendant is a citizen of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avails itself of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

4. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendant maintains offices, has agents, employs individuals, and/or transacts business in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. The majority of acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiff and the other class members took place in the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles. At all relevant times, Defendant maintained its headquarters/“nerve center” within the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff FIDEL RIVERA is an individual residing in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

6. Defendant BASMAT INC, d/b/a, MCSTARLITE COMPANY at all times herein mentioned, was and is, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles.

7. At all relevant times, Defendant BASMAT INC, d/b/a, MCSTARLITE COMPANY was the “employer” of Plaintiff within the meaning of all applicable California laws and statutes.

8. At all times herein relevant, Defendants BASMAT INC, d/b/a, MCSTARLITE COMPANY, 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/or assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers, 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.

9. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual or otherwise, of defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff who sue said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based on that information and belief alleges, 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 Plaintiff and the other class members as alleged in this Complaint. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to show the true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

10. Defendant BASMAT INC, d/b/a, MCSTARLITE COMPANY and DOES 1 through 100 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as “Defendants.”

11. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of

///

Plaintiff and the other class members so as to make each of said Defendants employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

12. Plaintiff brings this action on his own behalf and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and, thus, seeks class certification under California Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

13. The proposed class is defined as follows:

All current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked for any of the Defendants within the State of California at any time during the period from September 18, 2016 to final judgment and who reside in California.

14. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish subclasses as appropriate.

15. The class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation:

a. Numerosity: The class members are so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable. The membership of the entire class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, the class is estimated to be greater than fifty (50) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment records.

b. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of all other class members' as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the other class members with whom he has a well-defined community of interest.

c. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of each class member, with whom he has a well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no interest that is antagonistic to the other class members. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has

1 incurred, and during the pendency of this action will continue to incur,
2 costs and attorneys' fees, that have been, are, and will be necessarily
3 expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of
4 each class member.

5 d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other available methods for the
6 fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder
7 of all class members is impractical.

8 e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class
9 action will advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great
10 state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees
11 are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect
12 retaliation. However, class actions provide the class members who are
13 not named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of
14 their rights.

15 16. There are common questions of law and fact as to the class members that
16 predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The following common
17 questions of law or fact, among others, exist as to the members of the class:

18 a. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or
19 reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;

20 b. Whether Defendants' had a corporate policy and practice of failing to
21 pay their hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of
22 California for all hours worked and missed (short, late, interrupted,
23 and/or missed altogether) meal periods and rest breaks in violation of
24 California law;

25 c. Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class members to
26 work over eight (8) hours per day and/or over forty (40) hours per week
27 and failed to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiff
28 and the other class members;

- d. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the other class members of meal and/or rest periods or required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during meal and/or rest periods without compensation;
- e. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members for all hours worked;
- f. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members within the required time upon their discharge or resignation;
- g. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members during their employment;
- h. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the California Labor Code; including, *inter alia*, section 226;
- i. Whether Defendants kept complete and accurate payroll records as required by the California Labor Code, including, *inter alia*, section 1174(d);
- j. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs;
- k. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- l. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.;
- m. The appropriate amount of restitution and/or monetary penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and
- n. Whether Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

PAGA ALLEGATIONS

17. At all times herein set forth, PAGA was applicable to Plaintiff's employment by Defendants.

///

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

6 19. Pursuant to PAGA, a civil action under PAGA may be brought by an “aggrieved
7 employee,” who is any person that was employed by the alleged violator and against whom
8 one or more of the alleged violations was committed.

9 20. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants and the alleged violation was committed
10 against him during his time of employment and he is, therefore, an aggrieved employee.
11 Plaintiff and the other employees are “aggrieved employees” as defined by California Labor
12 Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees of Defendants, and one
13 or more of the alleged violations were committed against them.

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

- 17 a. The aggrieved employee shall give written notice by online submission
18 (hereinafter “Employee’s Notice”) to the Labor & Workforce
19 Development Agency (hereinafter “LWDA”) and by U.S. Certified Mail
20 to the employer of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code
21 alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support
22 the alleged violations.
- 23 b. The LWDA shall provide notice (hereinafter “LWDA Notice”) to the
24 employer and the aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not
25 intend to investigate the alleged violation within sixty (60) calendar days
26 of the postmark date of the Employee’s Notice. Upon receipt of the
27 LWDA Notice, or if the LWDA Notice is not provided within sixty-five
28 (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.

22. On September 11, 2020, Plaintiff provided written notice by online submission to the LWDA and by U.S. Certified Mail to Defendant BASMAT INC, d/b/a, MCSTARLITE COMPANY 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 has not received an LWDA Notice within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the date of Plaintiff's notice.

23. Therefore, Plaintiff has satisfied the administrative prerequisites under California Labor Code section 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendants, in addition to other remedies, for violations 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.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

24. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other persons as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles.

25. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee, from approximately June 2016 to approximately November 2019, in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

26. Defendants hired Plaintiff and the other class members, classified them as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees, and failed to compensate them for all hours worked and missed meal periods and/or rest breaks.

27. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the other class members, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

///

28. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and the other class members.

29. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff and the other class members.

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

31. Plaintiff and the other class members worked over eight (8) hours in a day, and/or forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.

32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants engaged in a pattern and practice of wage abuse against their hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California. This pattern and practice involved, *inter alia*, failing to pay them for all regular and/or overtime wages earned and for missed meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law.

33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation and that they were not receiving accurate overtime compensation for all overtime hours worked.

34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the other class members all required rest and meal periods during the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders and thus they are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other class member's 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 Plaintiff's and the other class member's regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed.

36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other class member's regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, and they did not receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other class members' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed.

37. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive at least minimum wages for compensation and that they were not receiving at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

38. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members 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, in fact, receive all such wages owed to them at the time of their discharge or resignation.

39. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive all wages owed to them during their employment. Plaintiff and the other class members 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.

40. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but, in fact, 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 Plaintiff and the other class members.

41. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Defendants had to keep complete and accurate payroll records

1 for Plaintiff and the other class members in accordance with California law, but, in fact, did
2 not keep complete and accurate payroll records.

3 42. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
4 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to
5 reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses.

6 43. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
7 knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and the other class
8 members pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such
9 compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely
10 represented to Plaintiff and the other class members that they were properly denied wages, all
11 in order to increase Defendants' profits.

12 44. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay overtime wages to
13 Plaintiff and the other class members for all overtime hours worked. Plaintiff and the other
14 class members were required to work more than eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours
15 per week without overtime compensation for all overtime hours worked.

16 45. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to provide all requisite
17 uninterrupted meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members.

18 46. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other
19 class members at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

20 47. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other
21 class members all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation.

22 48. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other
23 class members all wages within any time permissible under California law, including, *inter*
24 *alia*, California Labor Code section 204.

25 49. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to provide complete or
26 accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and the other class members.

27 50. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to keep complete or accurate
28 payroll records for Plaintiff and the other class members.

51. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs.

52. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to properly compensate Plaintiff and the other class members pursuant to California law in order to increase Defendants' profits.

53. California Labor Code section 218 states that nothing in Article 1 of the Labor Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to "sue directly . . . for any wages or penalty due to him [or her] under this article."

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)

(Against BASMAT INC, d/b/a, MCSTARLITE COMPANY and DOES 1 through 100)

54. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 53, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

55. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff, other class members, to the general public, and Defendants' competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiff seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

56. Defendants' activities as alleged herein are violations of California law, and constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

57. A violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq. may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the other class members, to work overtime without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198. Additionally, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the other class members, to work through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections

226.7 and 512(a). Defendants' policies and practices of failing to pay minimum wages violate California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Moreover, Defendants' policies and practices of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other class members violate California Labor Code sections 201, 202 and 204. Defendants also violated California Labor Code sections 226(a), 1174(d), 2800 and 2802.

58. As a result of the herein described violations of California law, Defendants unlawfully gained an unfair advantage over other businesses.

59. Plaintiff and the other class members have been personally injured by Defendants' unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not necessarily limited to the loss of money and/or property.

60. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code sections 17200, et seq., Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences September 18, 2016; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil procedure section 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California Labor Code § 2698, et seq.

(Against BASMAT INC, d/b/a, MCSTARLITE COMPANY and DOES 1 through 100)

61. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 60, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

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

///

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

64. Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt 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 one or more of the alleged violations was committed against them.

Failure to Pay Overtime

65. Defendants’ failure to pay legally required overtime wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

66. Defendants’ failure to provide legally required meal periods to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

Failure to Provide Rest Periods

67. Defendants’ failure to provide legally required rest periods to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 226.7.

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

68. Defendants’ failure to pay legally required minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination

69. Defendants’ failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees upon termination in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 and 202 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

70. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees during employment in accordance with Labor Code section 204 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 204.

Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements

71. Defendants' failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with Labor Code section 226(a) constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 226(a).

Failure to Keep Complete and Accurate Payroll Records

72. Defendants' failure to keep complete and accurate payroll records relating to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with California Labor Code section 1174(d) constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 1174(d).

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business-Related Expenses and Costs

73. Defendants' failure to reimburse Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees for necessary business-related expenses and costs in accordance with California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.

74. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699, Plaintiff, 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 in the amount of a 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;

///

- 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 a 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.

75. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(i), civil penalties recovered by aggrieved employees shall be distributed as follows: seventy-five percent (75%) to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency for the enforcement of labor laws and education of employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities and twenty-five percent (25%) to the aggrieved employees.

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorney General Act, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

Class Certification

1. That this action be certified as a class action;
2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class;

2 4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel immediately the names and most
3 current/last known contact information (address, e-mail and telephone numbers) of all class
4 members.

5 As to the First Cause of Action

6 5. That the Court decree, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
7 Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq. by failing to provide Plaintiff and the
8 other class members all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and
9 rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay at least minimum wages to
10 Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay Plaintiff's and the other class members'
11 wages timely as required by California Labor Code section 201, 202 and 204 and by violating
12 California Labor Code sections 226(a), 1174(d), 2800 and 2802.

13 6. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all the other class members and
14 all pre-judgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

15 7. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all
16 funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by
17 Defendants as a result of violation of California Business and Professions Code sections
18 17200, et seq.;

19 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
20 California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;

21 9. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to
22 California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq.; and

23 10. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

24 **As to the Second Cause of Action**

25 11. For civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699(a), (f) and
26 (g), costs/expenses, and attorneys' fees for violation of California Labor Code sections 201,
27 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802;
28 and

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

3 Dated: May 21, 2021

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC

4
5 By: 
6 Edwin Aiwanian
7 Attorneys for Plaintiff
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**FIRST AMENDED
SUMMONS
(CITACION JUDICIAL)**

SUM-100

**NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:
(AVISO AL DEMANDADO):**

BASMAT INC, d/b/a, MCSTARLITE COMPANY, an unknown business entity; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

**YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:
(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):**

FIDEL RIVERA, individually, "Additional Parties Attachment form is attached."

FOR COURT USE ONLY
(SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)
**CONFORMED COPY
ORIGINAL FILED**
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

MAY 24 2021

Sherri B. Carter, Executive Office/Clerk
By: Maisha Pryor, Deputy
Maisha Pryor

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. **NOTE:** The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case.

¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta.

Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. **AVISO:** Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is:
(El nombre y dirección de la corte es):

CASE NUMBER:
(Número del Caso):

20STCV35714

Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles
Stanley Mosk Courthouse, 111 N. Hill Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:

(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):
Edwin Aiwazian; 410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203, Glendale, California 91203; (818) 265-1020

DATE: **MAY 24 2021**
(Fecha)

SHERRI R. CARTER

Clerk, by
(Secretario)

Maisha Pryor

, Deputy
(Adjunto)

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)

(Para prueba de entrega de esta citación use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)).

[SEAL]



NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

1. ☐ as an individual defendant.
2. ☐ as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
3. ☐ on behalf of (specify):
under: ☐ CCP 416.10 (corporation) ☐ CCP 416.60 (minor)
☐ CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) ☐ CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
☐ CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) ☐ CCP 416.90 (authorized person)
☐ other (specify):
4. ☐ by personal delivery on (date):

Page 1 of 1

SHORT TITLE: Rivera vs. Basmat Inc, d/b/a, McStarlite Company	CASE NUMBER: 20STCV35714
--	-----------------------------

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

- This form may be used as an attachment to any summons if space does not permit the listing of all parties on the summons.
- If this attachment is used, insert the following statement in the plaintiff or defendant box on the summons: "Additional Parties Attachment form is attached."

List additional parties (Check only one box. Use a separate page for each type of party.):

☒ Plaintiff
 ☐ Defendant
 ☐ Cross-Complainant
 ☐ Cross-Defendant

and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act;

COPY

CONFORMED COPY
ORIGINAL FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

MAY 24 2021

Sherri B. Carter, Executive Office/Clerk
By: Maisha Pryor, Deputy
Maisha Pryor

1 Edwin Aiwazian (SBN 232943)
2 Arby Aiwazian (SBN 269827)
3 **LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC**
4 410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
5 Glendale, California 91203
6 Telephone: (818) 265-1020
7 Facsimile: (818) 265-1021

8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

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

11 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE**

12
13 FIDEL RIVERA, individually, and on behalf
14 of other members of the general public
15 similarly situated;

16 Plaintiff,

17 vs.

18 BASMAT INC, d/b/a, MCSTARLITE
19 COMPANY, an unknown business entity; and
20 DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

21 Defendants.

Case No.: 20STCV35714

Honorable William F. Highberger
Department 10

CLASS ACTION

PROOF OF SERVICE

Complaint Filed: September 18, 2020
Jury Trial Date: None Set

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203

22
23
24
25
26
27
28
PROOF OF SERVICE

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203, Glendale, California 91203.

On May 21, 2021, I served the foregoing document(s) described as:

- **FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND ENFORCEMENT UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT, CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 2698, ET SEQ.**
- **FIRST AMENDED SUMMONS**

on interested parties in this action by Electronic Service as follows:

Matthew B. Golper

mgolper@brgslaw.com

BALLARD ROSENBERG GOLPER & SAVITT LLP

15760 Ventura Boulevard, Eighteenth Floor

Encino, CA 91436

Telephone: (818)508-3700

Facsimile: (818)506-4827

Attorneys for Defendants

[X] BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE

Pursuant to the Court's Order regarding Electronic Service, I caused the documents described above to be E-Served through Case Anywhere by electronically mailing a true and correct copy through Case Anywhere to the individual(s) listed above.

[X] STATE

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on May 21, 2021, at Glendale, California.

Sarin Yeranossian