

1 MAYALL HURLEY P.C.
2 JOHN P. BRISCOE (SBN: 273690)
3 jbriscoe@mayallaw.com
4 2453 Grand Canal Boulevard
5 Stockton, California 95207-8253
6 Telephone: (209) 477-3833
7 Facsimile: (209) 473-4818

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff Raoof Abdul Sayad

9 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

10 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN

11 RAOOF ABDUL SAYAD, an individual,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 PEGASUS AVIATION SERVICES, LLC;
15 and DOES 1-100, inclusive,

16 Defendants.

Case No.:

STK-CV-WDE-2021-7032

CLASS ACTION, REPRESENTATIVE, AND
INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINT

1. FAILURE TO PAY SICK LEAVE AT
CORRECT RATE (CLASS ACTION)
2. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS
OR PAY PREMIUMS AT CORRECT RATE
(CLASS ACTION)
3. FAILURE TO FURNISH ACCURATE
ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS (CLASS
ACTION)
4. UNFAIR COMPETITION (CLASS ACTION)
5. PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT
6. DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION
7. RETALIATION FOR OPPOSING
DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT
8. RETALIATION FOR TAKING
PROTECTED MEDICAL LEAVE
9. RETALIATION FOR REQUESTING
ACCOMMODATION FOR DISABILITY
10. RELIGIOUS CREED DISCRIMINATION
11. FAILURE TO PREVENT
DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION
12. FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME AT
CORRECT RATE
13. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS
OR PAY PREMIUMS AT CORRECT RATE
14. FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES DUE
UPON END OF EMPLOYMENT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff Raoof Abdul Sayad brings this class, representative, and individual action against
2 Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC, a limited liability company; and Does 1 through 100, for violations
3 of the Labor Code and Government Code.

4 **PARTIES**

5 1. Raoof Abdul Sayad ("Sayad" or "Plaintiff") is and at all times relevant herein was
6 employed in San Joaquin County, California, and was an "employee" as defined by the Fair
7 Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA"), as well as the Labor Code and the applicable California
8 Industrial Wage Commission ("IWC") Order(s).

9 2. Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC ("Pegasus Aviation Services" or "Defendant") is an
10 Alaska limited liability company formed under the laws of that state.

11 3. At all times relevant herein, Pegasus Aviation Services has been an "employer" under
12 the FEHA, as well as the Labor Code and the applicable California Industrial Wage Commission
13 ("IWC") Order(s).

14 4. Pegasus Aviation Services and Does 1-100 are collectively referred to as Defendants.

15 5. Plaintiff is not aware of the true names and capacities of the Defendants sued herein as
16 Does 1 through 100, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise and therefore sues such
17 Defendants by these fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege their true names
18 and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each
19 of the fictitiously named Defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged
20 and that Plaintiff's injuries and damages herein alleged were legally caused by such Defendants.
21 Unless otherwise indicated, each Defendant was acting within the course and scope of said agency
22 and/or employment, with the knowledge and/or consent of said co-Defendant.

23 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that at all times mentioned
24 herein, each of the Defendants, including each Doe Defendant, was acting as the agent, servant,
25 employee, partner and/or joint venturer of and was acting in concert with each of the remaining
26 Defendants, including each Doe Defendant, in doing the things herein alleged, while at all times acting
27 within the course and scope of such agency, service, employment partnership, joint venture and/or
28

1 concert of action. Each Defendant, in doing the acts alleged herein, was acting both individually and
2 within the course and scope of such agency and/or employment, with the knowledge and/or consent of
3 the remaining Defendants.

4 **VENUE AND JURY TRIAL DEMAND**

5 7. Venue is proper in this court because the unlawful acts alleged herein took place in San
6 Joaquin County, California and Plaintiff's place of employment with Defendants was within San
7 Joaquin County. Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial.

8 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

9 8. Sayad was hired by Pegasus Aviation Services on or around June 2, 2018 as an Aircraft
10 Maintenance Technician. At all times during his employment, Sayad's employment was at the Stockton
11 Airport in Stockton, California.

12 9. At all times during his employment with Pegasus Aviation Services, Sayad performed
13 his job duties with distinction and never received any writeups or other discipline in connection with
14 his job performance.

15 10. Sayad is a military veteran, and has knee and back disabilities in connection with his
16 prior military service. These disabilities sometimes limited Sayad's ability to perform every aspect of
17 his job duties, but he was generally accommodated by his coworkers.

18 11. Shortly after Sayad's employment began, he was subjected to harassment by a coworker,
19 Scott (last name unknown). Sayad is a practicing Muslim and he was provided the accommodation of
20 being allowed short breaks during the workday to pray. Scott was bothered by this and repeatedly told
21 Sayad that he couldn't pray at work. Scott also expressed annoyance that Sayad is disabled and
22 sometimes needed assistance from his coworkers. Scott stated to Sayad and others that he would review
23 his employment application to see if Sayad disclosed his disability during the hiring process. Scott also
24 told Sayad's coworkers that Sayad was "on thin ice" and was going to be fired.

25 12. Sayad thus felt that he was being harassed because of his religious beliefs and
26 observances and also his disability, and complained as much to the Vice President of Pegasus Aviation
27

1 Services, Kyle Weber ("Weber"). The matter was addressed and Scott was transferred to a different
2 work location.

3 13. Sayad's daughter is disabled and Sayad would sometimes need to take time off work to
4 care for her. On October 13, 2020, Sayad was assigned to work from 7:00 p.m. through 3:00 a.m. the
5 following day. An aircraft was delayed in arriving at the airport, past the end of Sayad's scheduled
6 shift. As Sayad's daughter had a doctor's appointment the morning following this workshift, Sayad
7 informed his supervisor, Ron Poulin ("Poulin"), of the same. Poulin replied derisively: "I see[,] a dr
8 appt at 0600 am [--] must be a great doctor" (inferring that he didn't believe there even was an
9 appointment) and threatening that "there may be consequences to this decision". Sayad complained
10 about this interaction to Pegasus Aviation Services' human resources department on October 15, 2020,
11 specifically pointing out that he had a scheduled doctor's appointment for his disabled daughter, and
12 that he felt he was harassed and retaliated against.

13 14. In or around October 2020, Sayad was injured in an on-the-job accident in which he
14 slipped, fell, and suffered an injury to his lower back. As a result of this injury (which compounded
15 Sayad's back disability), Sayad was unable to perform his job duties; he was assigned to light duty,
16 doing paperwork in the office. This light duty accommodated Sayad's disclosed disability and did not
17 pose an undue burden for Pegasus Aviation Services. Sayad also took a few days of intermittent
18 medical leave as his symptoms flared.

19 15. In or around April 2020, Sayad learned that Scott was returning to the Stockton location.
20 Sayad spoke with Poulin about this, explaining that Scott previously harassed him about his religious
21 observances and his disability, but that as long as Scott didn't bother him, his return would not be a
22 problem.

23 16. On April 20, 2021, Sayad was suddenly informed that he was terminated. Weber and
24 Leslie Roy ("Roy") of human resources told Sayad that he was "not fulfilling the requirements of the
25 customers." Neither Weber nor Roy would or could elaborate as to what this meant, or how Sayad had
26 in any way failed to do his job. At the end of the termination meeting, Weber told Sayad that he was
27 eligible for rehire, and "when you get better, call me, I mean it. We'll hire you again." Thus, the stated
28

1 reason for Sayad's termination was pretextual. In reality, Sayad was terminated for taking protected
2 medical leave, because of his disclosed physical disability, his association with another disabled person,
3 for requesting accommodation for his disclosed physical disability, for opposing unlawful
4 discrimination and harassment, and because of his religious belief or observances.

5 17. On May 3, 2021, Sayad filed a complaint with the California Department of Fair
6 Employment and Housing, and was issued a right-to-sue notice that same day. (**Exhibit 1.**)

7 18. In addition, Sayad was not paid all wages to which he was entitled under law.

8 19. At all times during his employment with Pegasus Aviation Services, Sayad was properly
9 classified and paid as a nonexempt, hourly employee. Though he worked and earned overtime, Pegasus
10 Aviation Services failed to pay Sayad's overtime at the appropriate rate of pay, resulting in an
11 underpayment of wages.

12 20. Sayad earned and was paid nondiscretionary bonuses for good performance. For
13 example, during the pay period of June 21 – July 4, 2020, Sayad earned a nondiscretionary bonus in the
14 amount of \$1,200. (**Exhibit 2.**) However, and though Sayad worked overtime during this pay period,
15 Pegasus Aviation Services failed to incorporate the value of this earned nondiscretionary bonus into
16 Sayad's "regular rate of pay" for purposes of calculating and paying overtime wages; instead, it merely
17 took Saad's base hourly rate of \$32 and multiplied it by 1.5. (**Exhibit 3.**) Thus, Pegasus Aviation
18 services violated Labor Code section 510.

19 21. Pegasus Aviation Services also failed to provide paid sick days to its California
20 employees, in accordance with the California Labor Code. Sayad's wage statements did not show any
21 accrued paid sick days or paid time off, and he was not provided with any separate writing showing
22 such. Furthermore, and on information and belief, Pegasus Aviation Services did not provide its
23 California employees with paid sick days or paid time off in accordance with Labor Code section 246.
24 To the extent that it did so, and on information and belief, Pegasus Aviation Services did not provide its
25 California employees with paid sick days or paid time off at the appropriate "regular rate of pay",
26 accounting for the value of earned nondiscretionary bonuses and other items of compensation. Thus,
27 Pegasus Aviation Services violated Labor Code sections 233 and 246.

1 22. Because Sayad was not paid overtime at the appropriate rate, *supra*, the itemized wage
2 statements furnished to him failed to accurately show the gross wages earned, the net wages earned,
3 and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
4 worked at each hourly rate, in violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivisions (a)(1), (5), and (9),
5 respectively.

6 23. Furthermore, Sayad was denied rest and meal periods to which he was entitled. Sayad
7 was *never* relieved of all duty and authorized and permitted to take an uninterrupted, ten-minute rest
8 period. Further, and while Sayad typically received meal periods, they were not authorized and
9 permitted until Sayad had already worked six hours or more. Sayad was not paid an hour of pay at his
10 regular rate of compensation for every rest and meal period not provided. Additionally, and when
11 Sayad was paid rest and/or meal premiums, they were paid only at his base, hourly rate, not accounting
12 for the value of earned nondiscretionary bonuses and other items of compensation. Thus, Pegasus
13 Aviation Services violated Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512.

14 24. Last, Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC failed to maintain compete and accurate payroll
15 records, as required by the Labor Code. On May 18, 2021, and following written request by Sayad's
16 attorneys, Pegasus Aviation Services produced a copy of Sayad's "Employee Earnings Reports"—
17 computerized summaries of Sayad's earnings. (**Exhibit 4.**) However, each of these reports fail to show
18 the inclusive dates of the pay period for which Sayad was paid, the address of the legal entity that is the
19 employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number
20 of hours worked at each rate, in violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivisions (a)(6), (8), and (9),
21 respectively. By failing to keep on file either copies of Sayad's wage statements or a computer-
22 generated record, accurately showing all information required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision
23 (a), Pegasus Aviation Services committed a further violation of that statute.

24 25. Sayad's employment with Pegasus Aviation Services ended on or around April 20,
25 2021. However, at no point has he been paid the full balance of unpaid overtime wages, accrued paid
26 sick time, and premium payments for rest/meal period violations, *supra*. Accordingly, Pegasus Aviation
27 Services violated Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

1 26. On May 18, 2021, Sayad provided written notice to the Labor and Workforce
2 Development Agency ("LWDA") and Pegasus Aviation Services, regarding the specific provisions
3 of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support those
4 alleged violations. (**Exhibit 5.**)

5 27. The foregoing list of misconduct is a partial list only and set forth by way of example.

6 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

7 28. Sayad brings the First, Second, Third, and Fourth Causes of Action, on behalf of himself
8 and all others similarly situated, as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure 382. The classes
9 which Sayad seeks to represent consist of the following:

- 10
- 11 a. All current and former nonexempt California employees of Defendants who
12 were paid premium payments for missed rest breaks and nondiscretionary
13 bonuses and/or other items of compensation during one or more pay periods at
14 any time from four years prior to the filing of this complaint through the entry
15 of final judgment in this action (the "Rest Break Class");
16 b. All current and former nonexempt California employees of Defendants who
17 received nondiscretionary bonuses and/or other items of compensation and
18 received sick pay during one or more pay periods at any time from four years
19 prior to the filing of this complaint through the entry of final judgment in this
20 action (the "Sick Pay Class"); and
21 c. All members of the Rest Break Class and the Sick Pay Class who received one
22 or more wage statements at any time from one year prior to the filing of this
23 complaint through the entry of final judgment in this action (the "Wage
24 Statement Class").

19 The Rest Break Class, the Sick Pay Class, and the Wage Statement Class are collectively referred to as
20 "the Class."

21 29. The Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable, and the
22 disposition of their claims in a class action is a benefit to the parties and to the Court. Plaintiff is
23 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants employ more than 100 employees
24 who satisfy the class definition. Although the exact number and identity of class members is not
25 presently known, they can be identified in Defendants' records through coordinated discovery pursuant
26 to this class action.

1 30. This action may be maintained as a class because the questions of law and fact which are
2 common to class members clearly predominate over any questions affecting only individual members
3 and because a class action is superior to other available methods for adjudicating the controversy.

4 31. There are numerous common questions of law and fact arising out of Defendants'
5 conduct. This class action focuses on Defendants': (a) systematic failure to properly pay employees for
6 missed rest breaks; (b) systematic failure to properly pay employees with paid sick leave; and (c)
7 systematic failure to comply with Labor Code section 226(a).

8 32. Furthermore, common questions of fact and law predominate over any questions
9 affecting only individual members of the class. The predominating common or class-wide questions of
10 law and fact include the following:

- 11 a. Whether Defendants failed to properly calculate and pay their nonexempt
12 California employees with premium payments for missed rest breaks;
- 13 b. Whether Defendants failed to properly calculate and pay their nonexempt
14 California employees with paid sick leave;
- 15 c. Whether the wage statements Defendants furnished to their California employees
16 comply with Labor Code section 226;
- 17 d. Whether the alleged violations of the Labor Code constitute unfair business
18 practices;
- 19 e. Whether the Class is entitled to injunctive relief; and
- 20 f. Whether the Class is entitled to unpaid wages, statutory penalties, and/or
21 restitutionary relief, and the amount of the same.

22 33. Sayad's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class as a whole, all of
23 whom have sustained and/or will sustain damage and injury as a proximate and/or legal result of the
24 alleged violations of Defendants. Sayad's claims are typical of those of the Class because Defendants
25 subjected Plaintiff and each member of the Class to the same violations alleged herein.

26 34. The defenses of Defendants, to the extent that such defenses apply, are applicable
27 generally to the whole Class and are not distinguishable as to the proposed class members.

1 35. Sayad will fairly and adequately protect the interests of all members of the Class, and
2 has retained attorneys with extensive experience in litigation, including class and representative actions.
3 Plaintiff has no interests that conflict with those of the Class. Sayad are able to fairly and adequately
4 protect the interests of all members of the class because it is in their best interest to prosecute the claims
5 alleged herein in order to obtain the full compensation due themselves and the other class members.

6 36. A class action is superior to any other method available for fairly and efficiently
7 adjudicating the controversy because 1) joinder of individual class members is not practicable, 2)
8 litigating the claims of individual class members would be unnecessarily costly and burdensome and
9 would deter individual claims, 3) litigating the claims of individual class members would create a risk
10 of inconsistent or varying adjudications that would establish incompatible standards of conduct for
11 Defendants, 4) class members still working for Defendants may be fearful of retaliation if they were to
12 bring individual claims, 5) class members would be discouraged from pursuing individual claims
13 because the damages available to them are relatively small, and 6) public policy encourages the use of
14 the class actions to enforce employment laws and protect individuals who, by virtue of their
15 subordinate position, are particularly vulnerable.

16 37. Judicial economy will be served by maintenance of this lawsuit as a class action. To
17 process numerous virtually identical individual cases will significantly increase the expense on the
18 Court, the class members, and Defendants, all while unnecessarily delaying the resolution of this
19 matter. There are no obstacles to effective and efficient management of this lawsuit as a class action by
20 this Court and doing so will provide multiple benefits to the litigating parties including, but not limited
21 to, efficiency, economy, and uniform adjudication with consistent results.

22 38. Notice of a certified class action and any result or resolution of the litigation can be
23 provided to class members by mail, email, publication, or such other methods of notice as deemed
24 appropriate by the Court.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS OR PAY PREMIUMS AT CORRECT RATE
(Lab. Code, § 226.7)
By the Rest Break Class Against Defendants

39. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth above as though fully set forth herein, except as said paragraphs are inconsistent with the allegations of this cause of action.

40. Labor Code section 226.7 requires employers to provide employees rest periods as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission. It states:

- a. No employer shall require any employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.
- b. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period or rest period in accordance with an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the meal or rest period is not provided.

41. Section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order provides:

“(A) Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period. Nothing in this provision shall prevent an employer from staggering rest periods to avoid interruption in the flow of work and to maintain continuous operations, or from scheduling rest periods to coincide with breaks in the flow of work that occur in the course of the workday. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time for every four (4) hours worked, or major fraction thereof. Rest periods shall take place at employer designated areas, which may include or be limited to the employees' immediate work area.

(B) Rest periods need not be authorized in limited circumstances when the disruption of continuous operations would jeopardize the product or process of the work. However, the employer shall make up the missed rest period within the same workday or compensate the employee for the missed ten (10) minutes of rest time at his/her regular rate of pay within the same pay period.

1 (C) A rest period need not be authorized for employees whose total daily work time
2 is less than three and one-half (3 ½) hours. Authorized rest period time shall be
counted as hours worked for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

3 (D) If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the
4 applicable provisions of this order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour
5 of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest
period is not provided."

6 42. Per the California Supreme Court, the "regular rate of compensation", for purposes
7 of paying premiums for denied rest breaks, must account for not only hourly wages for also other
8 nondiscretionary payments for work performed by the employee. (*Ferra v. Loews Hollywood*
9 *Hotel, LLC* (2021) 2021 WL 2965438.)

10 43. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and other members of the Rest Break
11 Class were not provided with rest breaks as required by law and did not receive an additional hour
12 of premium pay at the appropriate regular rate of compensation for each missed rest break.

13 44. Wherefore, Plaintiff and the Rest Break Class have been injured and request relief
14 as hereinafter provided.

15 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
16 **FAILURE TO PAY SICK LEAVE AT CORRECT RATE**
17 **(Lab. Code, §§ 218, 233, 246 et seq.)**
By the Sick Pay Class Against Defendants

18 45. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation set
19 forth above as though fully set forth herein, except as said paragraphs are inconsistent with the
20 allegations of this cause of action.

21 46. Labor Code section 246(l) requires that employers pay sick time pay to non-exempt
22 employees at that employee's "regular rate of pay."

23 47. According to the California Supreme Court, sick pay is a form of wages. (*Murphy v.*
24 *Kenneth Cole Productions* (2007) 40 Cal.4th 1094, 1103.)

25 48. Labor Code section 233 provides that "any employer who provides sick leave for
26 employees shall permit an employee to use in any calendar year the employee's accrued and
27 available sick leave entitlement, in an amount not less than the sick leave that would be accrued
28

1 during six months at the employee's then current rate of entitlement, for the reasons specified in
2 subdivision (a) of Section 246.5.”

3 49. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay
4 Plaintiff and other members of the Sick Pay Class sick pay as required by law. Accordingly,
5 Plaintiff and other members of the Sick Pay Class did not receive the full amount of paid sick time
6 that they were entitled to receive by law, and were therefore denied the right to use sick leave
7 within the meaning of Labor Code sections 233(a) and (c).

8 50. Any employer who violates Labor Code section 233 is liable to employees for the
9 greater of one days' pay or actual damages, reasonable equitable relief, and reasonable attorneys'
10 fees and costs. (Lab. Code, § 233, subds. (d), (e).)

11 51. Further, Labor Code section 218 authorizes a private right of action to recover unpaid
12 wages.

13 52. Wherefore, Plaintiff and the Sick Pay Class have been injured as set forth above and
14 request relief as hereafter provided.

15 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**
16 **FAILURE TO FURNISH COMPLETE AND ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**
17 **(Lab. Code, § 226(a))**
18 **By the Wage Statement Class Against Defendants**

19 53. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation set
20 forth above as though fully set forth herein, except as said paragraphs are inconsistent with the
21 allegations of this cause of action.

22 54. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226(a) “every employer shall, semimonthly or at the
23 time of each payment of wages, furnish each of his or her employees, either as a detachable part of the
24 check, draft, or voucher paying the employee’s wages, or separately when the wages are paid by
25 personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2)
26 total hours worked by the employee [. . .], (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable
27 piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, (5) net wages earned, (6) the
28 inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the

1 last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number, (8) the name
2 and address of the legal entity that is the employer [. . .], (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during
3 the pay period and corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee and, if
4 the employer is a temporary services employer [. . .], the rate of pay and the total hours worked for each
5 temporary services assignment.”

6 55. An employee suffering injury as a result of the knowing and intentional failure by an
7 employer to comply with Labor Code section 226(a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual
8 damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred
9 dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed the aggregate
10 penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney’s
11 fees. (Lab. Code, § 226, subd. (e)(1).)

12 56. An employee is deemed to suffer injury if the employer fails to provide a wage
13 statement or if the employer fails to provide accurate and complete information as required by any one
14 or more of the items (1) to (9), inclusive, of subdivision (a) and the employee cannot promptly and
15 easily determine from the wage statement alone, i) the amount of gross/net wages paid to the employee
16 during the pay period or any of the other information required to be provided pursuant to Labor Code
17 section 226(a) items (2) to (4), inclusive, (6) and (9), ii) deductions made by the employer, iii) the name
18 and address of the employer and iv) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her
19 social security number or employee identification number. (Lab. Code, § 226, subds. (e)(2)(A), (B)(i)-
20 (iv).) “Promptly and easily determine” means a reasonable person would be able to readily ascertain
21 the information without reference to other documents or information. (Lab. Code, § 226, subd.
22 (e)(2)(C).)

23 57. As set forth above, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to furnish accurate
24 itemized wage statements which complied with Labor Code section 226.

25 58. Wherefore, Plaintiff and the other members of the Wage Statement Class have been
26 injured as set forth above and request relief as hereafter provided.

27 ///

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES
(Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17200, *et seq.*)

By the Rest Break Class and the Sick Pay Class Against Defendants

108. Plaintiff hereby reallege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation set forth above as though fully set forth herein, except as said paragraphs are inconsistent with the allegations of this cause of action.

109. The statutory violations, as alleged above, are unfair business practices within the meaning of the Unfair Competition Law (Business and Professions Code sections 17200 *et seq.*), and include, but are not limited to, failing to properly pay overtime wages, impermissible taking of gratuities or tips, and failure to provide compliant rest and meal periods.

110. Wherefore, Plaintiff and the other members of the Rest Break Class and the Sick Pay Class have been injured as set forth above and request relief as hereafter provided.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT
(Lab. Code, § 2698 *et seq.*)
By Plaintiff Against Defendants

115. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth above as though fully set forth herein, except as said paragraphs are inconsistent with the allegations of this cause of action.

116. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), any provision of the Labor Code which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA for violations of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures outlined in Labor Code section 2699.3.

117. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants and the alleged violations were committed against him during his time of employment. Plaintiff is therefore an aggrieved employee as defined by Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (c). Other current and former employees are also

1 aggrieved employees in that one or more of the alleged violations were also committed against
2 them during their time of employment with Defendants.

3 118. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f), the civil penalty recoverable
4 in a PAGA action is that which is provided for by the Labor Code or, where no civil penalty is
5 specifically provided, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for
6 the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for
7 each subsequent violation.

8 119. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (g), an aggrieved
9 employee may recover the civil penalty on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former
10 employees against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed. Furthermore, any
11 employee who prevails in any such action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees
12 and costs.

13 120. Wherefore, Plaintiff and other employees (current and former) have been aggrieved
14 as set forth above and request relief as hereafter provided.

15 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
16 **DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION**
17 **(Gov. Code, § 12940, subd. (a))**
18 **By Plaintiff Against Defendants**

19 59. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporates by reference each paragraph above as
20 though fully set forth herein, except as said paragraphs are inconsistent with the allegations of this
21 cause of action.

22 60. The Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA") explicitly prohibits an employer
23 from refusing to hire or employ a person, discharging a person from employment, or discriminating
24 against such person in compensation or in terms, conditions or privileges of employment on the
25 basis of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability,
26 medical condition, marital status, sex, age or sexual orientation. (Gov. Code, § 12940, subd. (a).)
27 "Race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability,
28 medical condition, marital status, sex, age, or sexual orientation" includes a perception that the

1 person has any of those characteristics or that the person is associated with a person who has, or is
2 perceived to have, any of those characteristics. (Gov. Code, § 12926, subd. (n).)

3 61. At all times relevant herein mentioned, Plaintiff was qualified for the position he
4 held with Defendants.

5 62. Defendants were at all times material herein Plaintiff's employer pursuant to
6 Government Code section 12926, subdivision (d) and were therefore barred from discriminating in
7 its employment decisions in violation of Government Code section 12940, subdivision (a).

8 63. Nevertheless, as set forth above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff based on
9 the basis of disability, in violation of Government Code section 12940, subdivision (a).

10 64. Defendants' actions towards Plaintiff were committed by them, their officers,
11 directors, and/or managing agents, and/or employees in an oppressive, fraudulent, and malicious
12 manner, and ratified by them, in order to injure or damage Plaintiff, thereby justifying an award of
13 punitive damages.

14 65. Wherefore, Plaintiff has been injured as set forth above and requests relief as
15 hereafter provided.

16 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
17 **RETALIATION FOR OPPOSING DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT**
18 **(Gov. Code, § 12940, subd. (h))**
19 **By Plaintiff Against Defendants**

20 66. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporates by reference each paragraph above as
21 though fully set forth herein, except as said paragraphs are inconsistent with the allegations of this
22 cause of action.

23 67. The FEHA explicitly prohibits an employer from retaliating against an employee
24 because the employee has opposed any practices forbidden by the FEHA or because the employee
25 has filed a complaint, testified or assisted in any proceeding under the FEHA. (Gov. Code, §
26 12940, subd. (h).)

27 68. Nevertheless, as set forth above, Defendants retaliated against Plaintiff in violation
28 of Government Code section 12940, subdivision (h).

1 69. The acts taken toward Plaintiff were carried out by and/or ratified by Defendants
2 and/or managing agents/employees of Defendants acting in an oppressive, fraudulent and malicious
3 manner in order to injure or damage Plaintiff, thereby justifying an award of punitive damages.

4 70. Wherefore, Plaintiff has been injured as set forth above and requests relief as
5 hereafter provided.

6 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
7 **RETALIATION FOR TAKING PROTECTED MEDICAL LEAVE**
8 **(Gov. Code, § 12945.2)**
 By Plaintiff Against Defendants

9 71. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporates by reference each and every paragraph
10 set forth above as though fully set forth herein, except as said paragraphs are inconsistent with the
11 allegations of this cause of action.

12 72. The California Family Rights Act ("CFRA") is part of the FEHA and explicitly
13 prohibits an employer or person from discharging, expelling, or otherwise discriminating against
14 any person because the person has taken protected medical leave. (Gov. Code, § 12945.2.)

15 73. Nevertheless, as set forth above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff for
16 taking leave pursuant to the CFRA.

17 74. Defendants' actions towards Plaintiff were committed or ratified by Defendants,
18 and/or their managing agents and/or employees in an oppressive, fraudulent, and malicious manner
19 in order to injure or damage Plaintiff, thereby justifying an award of punitive damages.

20 75. Wherefore, Plaintiff requests relief as hereafter provided.

21 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
22 **RETALIATION FOR REQUESTING ACCOMMODATION FOR DISABILITY**
23 **(Gov. Code, § 12940, subd. (m)(2))**
 By Plaintiff Against Defendants

24 76. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation
25 set forth above as though fully set forth herein, except as said paragraphs are inconsistent with the
26 allegations of this cause of action.

77. The FEHA explicitly prohibits an employer from retaliating or otherwise discriminating against a person for requesting accommodation for a disability, regardless of whether the request was granted. (Gov. Code, § 12940, subd. (m)(2).)

78. Nevertheless, as set forth above, Defendants unlawfully retaliated against Plaintiff for requesting accommodation, in violation of the FEHA.

79. As a result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered damages.

80. Wherefore, Plaintiff seeks damages as set forth below.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
RELIGIOUS CREED DISCRIMINATION – FAILURE TO ACCOMMODATE
 (Gov. Code, § 12940, subd. (a))
 By Plaintiff Against Defendants

81. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporates by reference each paragraph above as though fully set forth herein, except as said paragraphs are inconsistent with the allegations of this cause of action.

82. The Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA") explicitly prohibits an employer from refusing to hire or employ a person, discharging a person from employment, or discriminating against such person in compensation or in terms, conditions or privileges of employment on the basis of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, marital status, sex, age or sexual orientation. (Gov. Code, § 12940, subd. (a).) "Race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, marital status, sex, age, or sexual orientation" includes a perception that the person has any of those characteristics or that the person is associated with a person who has, or is perceived to have, any of those characteristics. (Gov. Code, § 12926, subd. (n).)

83. The FEHA further requires an employer to make reasonable accommodation for a person's religious belief or observance without undue hardship. (Gov. Code, § 12926, subd. (l).)

84. At all times relevant herein mentioned, Plaintiff was qualified for the position he held with Defendants.

1 85. Defendants were at all times material herein Plaintiff's employer pursuant to
2 Government Code section 12926, subdivision (d) and were therefore barred from discriminating in
3 its employment decisions in violation of Government Code section 12940, subdivision (a).

4 86. Nevertheless, as set forth above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff based on
5 the basis of religious belief or observance, in violation of Government Code section 12940,
6 subdivision (a).

7 87. Defendants' actions towards Plaintiff were committed by them, their officers,
8 directors, and/or managing agents, and/or employees in an oppressive, fraudulent, and malicious
9 manner, and ratified by them, in order to injure or damage Plaintiff, thereby justifying an award of
10 punitive damages.

11 88. Wherefore, Plaintiff has been injured as set forth above and requests relief as
12 hereafter provided.

13 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
14 **FAILURE TO PREVENT DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION**
15 **(Gov. Code, § 12940, subd. (k))**
16 **By Plaintiff Against Defendants**

17 89. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation
18 set forth above as though fully set forth herein, except as said paragraphs are inconsistent with the
19 allegations of this cause of action.

20 90. FEHA requires an employer to take all reasonable steps necessary to prevent
21 discrimination and retaliation from occurring. (Gov. Code, § 12940, subd. (k).)

22 91. Nevertheless, as set forth above, Defendants failed to prevent discrimination and
23 retaliation against Plaintiff.

24 92. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has suffered damages.

25 93. Defendants' actions towards Plaintiff were committed by them, their officers,
26 directors, and/or managing agents, and/or employees in an oppressive, fraudulent, and malicious
27 manner, and ratified by them, in order to injure or damage Plaintiff, thereby justifying an award of
28 punitive damages.

1 94. Wherefore, Plaintiff has been injured as set forth above and requests relief as
2 hereafter provided.

3 **TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
4 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME AT CORRECT RATE**
5 **(Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198)**
6 **By Plaintiff Against Defendants**

7 95. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation set
8 forth above as though fully set forth herein, except as said paragraphs are inconsistent with the
9 allegations of this cause of action.

10 96. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 510, any work in excess of eight hours in
11 one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours
12 worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no
13 less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of 12
14 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an
15 employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall
16 be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an employee.

17 97. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1198, the maximum hours of work and
18 standard conditions of labor fixed by the commission shall be the maximum hours of work and the
19 standard conditions of labor for employees and the employment of any employee for longer hours
20 than those fixed by the commission or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is
21 unlawful.

22 98. The "regular rate of pay" includes all remuneration for employment paid to the
23 employee and includes, but is not limited to, hourly earnings, salary, piece work earnings,
24 commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and the value of meals and lodging. See DLSE
25 Enforcement Policies and Interpretations Manual Section 49.

26 99. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff regularly worked overtime.

27 100. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay the
28 proper overtime wages due to Plaintiff.

1 101. Wherefore, Plaintiff has been injured as set forth above and requests relief as hereafter
2 provided.

3 **THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
4 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS OR PAY PREMIUMS AT CORRECT RATE**
5 **(Lab. Code, §§ 226.7, 512)**
6 **By Plaintiff Against Defendants**

7 102. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation
8 set forth above as though fully set forth herein, except as said paragraphs are inconsistent with the
9 allegations of this cause of action.

10 103. Labor Code section 226.7 requires employers to provide employees meal periods as
11 mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission. It states:

- 12 a. No employer shall require any employee to work during any meal or rest
13 period mandated by an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare
14 Commission.
15 b. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period or rest period in
16 accordance with an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission,
17 the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the
18 employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the meal or
19 rest period is not provided.

20 104. Labor Code section 512(a) and the applicable wage order provide that an employer
21 may not employ a person for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing that
22 employee a meal period of not less than thirty minutes, except that if the total work period per day
23 is no more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer
24 and employee. An employer may not employ a person for a work period of more than ten hours
25 per day without providing an employee with a second meal period of not less than thirty minutes,
26 except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than twelve hours, the meal
27 period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee, and if the first
28 meal period was not waived.

1 105. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff was not provided with meal breaks as
2 required by law and did not receive an additional hour of premium pay for each missed meal
3 period.

4 106. Wherefore, Plaintiff has been injured and requests relief as hereinafter provided.

5 **FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
6 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES DUE AT END OF EMPLOYMENT**
7 **(Lab. Code, § 201, *et seq.*)**
8 **By Plaintiff Against Defendants**

9 107. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation set
10 forth above as though fully set forth herein, except as said paragraphs are inconsistent with the
11 allegations of this cause of action.

12 108. Labor Code section 201 provides that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages
13 earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.

14 109. Labor Code section 202 requires an employer to pay an employee all earned wages
15 within 72 hours of the employee quitting his or her employment, or immediately at the time of quitting
16 if the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit.

17 110. As set forth above, Plaintiff was not timely paid all earned but unpaid wages when her
18 employment with Defendants ended.

19 111. Wherefore, Plaintiff has been injured as set forth above and requests relief as hereafter
20 provided.

21 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

22 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against Defendants as follows:

23 **As to the First, Second, Third, and Fourth Causes of Action:**

- 24 1. That this Court certify the Class;
25 2. That this Court appoint Plaintiff as the representative of the Class;
26 3. That this Court appoint Mayall Hurley, P.C. as Class Counsel;
27
28

4. That this Court award actual, compensatory, special, and general damages as well as restitutionary relief to Sayad and the members of the Class, including but not limited to the remedies provided for under Labor Code section 233, subdivision (d);
5. That this Court award injunctive relief, including that available under Labor Code section 226(h) and Business and Professions Code Section 17203;
6. That this Court award penalties and liquidated damages including, but not limited to, those available under Labor Code §§ 226(e) and 226.7 to Plaintiff and the members of the Class;
7. That this Court award statutory attorneys' fees and costs, including those available under Labor Code §§ 218.5, 226(e)(1), 233(e), 1194, and 2699(g), as well as Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5;
8. That this Court award prejudgment and post-judgment interest according to any applicable provision of law or as otherwise permitted by law; and
9. That this Court award such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.

As to the Fifth Cause of Action:

1. For civil penalties, including but not limited to those available under Labor Code sections 226.3, 558, and 2699(f);
2. For injunctive relief;
3. For statutory attorneys' fees and costs, including but not limited to those available under Labor Code section 2699(g);
4. For prejudgment and post-judgment interest according to any applicable provision of law or as otherwise permitted by law, including those available under Civil Code sections 3287(a) and 3289(b); and
5. For such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.

As to the Sixth through Eleventh Causes of Action:

1. For compensatory damages, both general and special;
2. For punitive damages;

3. For injunctive relief;
4. For statutory attorneys' fees and costs, including those available under Government Code section 12965(b) and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;
5. For prejudgment and post-judgment interest according to any applicable provision of law or as otherwise permitted by law, including those available under Civil Code sections 3287(a) and 3289(b); and
6. For such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.

As to the Twelfth, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Causes of Action:


1. That this Court award injunctive relief, including that available under Labor Code sections 226(h) and 248.5(e);
2. That this Court award unpaid wages;
3. That this Court award penalties including, but not limited to, those available under Labor Code section 203 and 226;
4. That this Court award statutory attorneys' fees and costs, including those available under Labor Code section 226, subdivisions (e)(1) and (h), as well as those available under Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;
5. That this Court award prejudgment and post-judgment interest according to any applicable provision of law or as otherwise permitted by law; and
6. That this Court award such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.

///

DATED: July 22, 2021

MAYALL HURLEY P.C.

By



JOHN P. BRISCOE
Attorneys for Plaintiff
RAOOF ABDUL SAYAD

Exhibit 1



DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT & HOUSING

KEVIN KISH, DIRECTOR

2218 Kausen Drive, Suite 100 | Elk Grove | CA | 95758
(800) 884-1684 (Voice) | (800) 700-2320 (TTY) | California's Relay Service at 711
<http://www.dfeh.ca.gov> | Email: contact.center@dfefh.ca.gov

May 3, 2021

John Briscoe
2453 Grand Canal Blvd.
Stockton, California 95207

RE: **Notice to Complainant's Attorney**
DFEH Matter Number: 202104-13389528
Right to Sue: Sayad / Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC

Dear John Briscoe:

Attached is a copy of your complaint of discrimination filed with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) pursuant to the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, Government Code section 12900 et seq. Also attached is a copy of your Notice of Case Closure and Right to Sue.

Pursuant to Government Code section 12962, DFEH will not serve these documents on the employer. You must serve the complaint separately, to all named respondents. Please refer to the attached Notice of Case Closure and Right to Sue for information regarding filing a private lawsuit in the State of California. A courtesy "Notice of Filing of Discrimination Complaint" is attached for your convenience.

Be advised that the DFEH does not review or edit the complaint form to ensure that it meets procedural or statutory requirements.

Sincerely,

Department of Fair Employment and Housing



DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT & HOUSING

2218 Kausen Drive, Suite 100 | Elk Grove | CA | 95758
(800) 884-1684 (Voice) | (800) 700-2320 (TTY) | California's Relay Service at 711
<http://www.dfeh.ca.gov> | Email: contact.center@dfeh.ca.gov

KEVIN KISH, DIRECTOR

May 3, 2021

RE: **Notice of Filing of Discrimination Complaint**
DFEH Matter Number: 202104-13389528
Right to Sue: Sayad / Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC

To All Respondent(s):

Enclosed is a copy of a complaint of discrimination that has been filed with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) in accordance with Government Code section 12960. This constitutes service of the complaint pursuant to Government Code section 12962. The complainant has requested an authorization to file a lawsuit. A copy of the Notice of Case Closure and Right to Sue is enclosed for your records.

This matter may qualify for DFEH's Small Employer Family Leave Mediation pilot program. Under this program, established under Government Code section 12945.21, a small employer with 5 -19 employees, charged with violation of the California Family Rights Act, Government Code section 12945.2, has the right to participate in DFEH's free voluntary mediation service. Under this program both the employee requesting an immediate right to sue and the employer charged with the violation may request that all parties participate in DFEH's free voluntary mediation service. A request for mediation must be made within 30 days of receipt of the Notice of Case Closure and Right to Sue. If mediation is requested, the employee is prohibited from filing a civil action until mediation is complete. The employee's statute of limitations to file a civil action, including for all related claims not arising under section 12945.2, is tolled from DFEH's receipt of a mediation request under section 12945.21 until mediation is complete. To request DFEH Small Employer Family Leave Mediation, email DRDOnlineRequests@dfeh.ca.gov and include the DFEH matter number indicated on the Right to Sue notice.

Please refer to the attached complaint for a list of all respondent(s) and their contact information.

No response to DFEH is requested or required.

Sincerely,

Department of Fair Employment and Housing



DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT & HOUSING

2218 Kausen Drive, Suite 100 | Elk Grove | CA | 95758
(800) 884-1684 (Voice) | (800) 700-2320 (TTY) | California's Relay Service at 711
<http://www.dfeh.ca.gov> | Email: contact.center@dfef.ca.gov

KEVIN KISH, DIRECTOR

May 3, 2021

Raof Sayad
8335 N. El Dorado St.
Stockton, California 95210

RE: **Notice of Case Closure and Right to Sue**
DFEH Matter Number: 202104-13389528
Right to Sue: Sayad / Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC

Dear Raof Sayad:

This letter informs you that the above-referenced complaint filed with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) has been closed effective May 3, 2021 because an immediate Right to Sue notice was requested.

This letter is also your Right to Sue notice. According to Government Code section 12965, subdivision (b), a civil action may be brought under the provisions of the Fair Employment and Housing Act against the person, employer, labor organization or employment agency named in the above-referenced complaint. The civil action must be filed within one year from the date of this letter.

This matter may qualify for DFEH's Small Employer Family Leave Mediation pilot program. Under this program, established under Government Code section 12945.21, a small employer with 5 -19 employees, charged with violation of the California Family Rights Act, Government Code section 12945.2, has the right to participate in DFEH's free voluntary mediation service. Under this program both the employee requesting an immediate right to sue and the employer charged with the violation may request that all parties participate in DFEH's free voluntary mediation service. A request for mediation must be submitted to the DFEH within 30 days of receipt of the Notice of Case Closure and Right to Sue. If mediation is requested, the employee is prohibited from filing a civil action until mediation is complete. The employee's statute of limitations to file a civil action, including for all related claims not arising under section 12945.2, is tolled from DFEH's receipt of a mediation request under section 12945.21 until mediation is complete. To request DFEH Small Employer Family Leave Mediation, email DRDOnlineRequests@dfef.ca.gov and include the DFEH matter number indicated on the Right to Sue notice.

To obtain a federal Right to Sue notice, you must contact the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to file a complaint within 30 days of receipt of this DFEH Notice of Case Closure or within 300 days of the alleged discriminatory act, whichever is earlier.

Sincerely,



STATE OF CALIFORNIA | Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency

GAVIN NEWSOM, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT & HOUSING

KEVIN KISH, DIRECTOR

2218 Kausen Drive, Suite 100 | Elk Grove | CA | 95758
(800) 884-1684 (Voice) | (800) 700-2320 (TTY) | California's Relay Service at 711
<http://www.dfeh.ca.gov> | Email: contact.center@dfef.ca.gov

Department of Fair Employment and Housing

COMPLAINT OF EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION
BEFORE THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING
Under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act
(Gov. Code, § 12900 et seq.)

In the Matter of the Complaint of

Raoof Sayad

DFEH No. 202104-13389528

Complainant,

vs.

Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC
3901 Old International Airport Rd.
Anchorage, Alaska 99502

Respondents

1. Respondent **Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC** is an employer **Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC** subject to suit under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) (Gov. Code, § 12900 et seq.).

2. Complainant **Raoof Sayad**, resides in the City of **Stockton**, State of **California**.

3. Complainant alleges that on or about **April 20, 2021**, respondent took the following adverse actions:

Complainant was harassed because of complainant's religious creed - includes dress and grooming practices, disability (physical or mental).

Complainant was discriminated against because of complainant's race, ancestry, national origin (includes language restrictions), color, religious creed - includes dress and grooming practices, disability (physical or mental), medical condition (cancer or genetic characteristic), association with a member of a protected class, family care or medical leave (cfra) and as a result of the discrimination was terminated, laid off, denied reasonable accommodation for a disability, other, denied work opportunities or assignments, denied or forced to transfer, denied family care or medical leave (cfra).

Complainant experienced retaliation because complainant reported or resisted any form of discrimination or harassment, requested or used a disability-related accommodation, requested or used a religious accommodation, participated as a witness in a discrimination

1 or harassment complaint, requested or used family care or medical leave (cfra) and as a
2 result was terminated, laid off, denied reasonable accommodation for a disability, other,
3 denied work opportunities or assignments, denied or forced to transfer, denied family care or
4 medical leave (cfra).

4 **Additional Complaint Details:** Complainant was hired by Respondent on or around June 2,
5 2018 as an Aircraft Maintenance Technician. At all times during his employment,
6 Complainant's employment was at the Stockton Airport in Stockton, California. At all times
7 during his employment, Complainant performed his job duties with dedication and
8 distinction, and never received any writeups or other discipline in connection with his job
9 performance. Complainant is a military veteran, and has knee and back disabilities in
10 connection with his prior military service. These disabilities sometimes limited Complainant's
11 ability to perform every aspect of his job duties, but he was generally accommodated by his
12 coworkers. Shortly after his employment began, Complainant was subjected to harassment
13 from a coworker, Scott (last name unknown). Complainant is a practicing Muslim and he
14 was provided the accommodation of being allowed short breaks during the workday to pray.
15 Scott was bothered by this and repeatedly told Complainant that he couldn't pray at work.
16 Scott also expressed annoyance that Complainant was disabled and sometimes needed
17 assistance from his coworkers. He stated to Complainant and others that he would review
18 his employment application to see if Complainant disclosed his disability during the hiring
19 process. Scott told Complainant's coworkers that Complainant was "on thin ice" and was
20 going to be fired. Complainant felt that he was being targeted because of his religious
21 beliefs and practices and also his disability, and complained as much to the Vice President
22 of Respondent, Kyle Weber. The matter was addressed and Scott was subsequently
23 transferred to a different work location. Additionally, Complainant's daughter is disabled and
24 Complainant would sometimes need to take time off work to care for her. On October 13,
25 2020, Complainant was assigned to work from 7:00 p.m. through 3:00 a.m. the following
26 day. An aircraft was delayed in arriving, past the end of Complainant's scheduled shift.
27 Complainant's daughter had a doctor's appointment scheduled for later that morning.
28 Complainant informed his supervisor, Ron Poulin, that due to this doctor's appointment he
would be unable to work past the end of his scheduled shift. Mr. Poulin replied derisively,
texting "I see a dr appt at 0600 am must be a great doctor" (inferring that he did not believe
Complainant) and threatening that "there may be consequences to that decision."
Complainant complained about this to Human Resources on October 15, 2020, specifically
pointing out that he had a scheduled doctor's appointment for his disabled daughter, and
that he felt he was harassed and retaliated against. In or around October 2020, Complainant
was injured in an on-the-job accident in which he slipped, fell, and suffered an injury to his
lower back. As a result of this injury (which compounded Complainant's back disability),
Complainant was unable to perform his normal job duties; he was assigned to light duty,
doing paperwork in the office. This light duty accommodated Complainant's disclosed
disability and it did not pose an undue burden for Respondent. Complainant also took a few
days of intermittent medical leave as his symptoms flared. In or around early April 2020,
Complainant learned that Scott was returning to the Stockton location. Complainant spoke
with Mr. Poulin about this, explaining that Scott previously harassed Complainant about his
praying and disability, but that as long as Scott didn't bother him, his return would not be a
problem. On April 20, 2021, Complainant was informed that he was terminated. Mr. Weber

1 and Leslie Roy of Human Resources told Complainant that he was "not fulfilling the
2 requirements of the customers." Neither Mr. Weber or Ms. Roy would elaborate as to what
3 this meant, or how Complainant had in any way failed to do his job. At the end of the
4 termination meeting, Mr. Weber told Complainant that he was eligible for rehire, and "when
5 you get better, call me, I mean it. We'll hire you again." Thus, the stated reason for
6 Complainant's termination was pretextual. The foregoing list of misconduct is a partial list
7 only, and set forth by way of example. Respondent failed to prevent the foregoing.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

1 VERIFICATION

2 I, **John P Briscoe**, am the **Attorney** in the above-entitled complaint. I have read the
3 foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The matters alleged are based
4 on information and belief, which I believe to be true.

5 On May 3, 2021, I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of
6 California that the foregoing is true and correct.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
Stockton, CA

Exhibit 2

Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC

2553 Dulles View Dr, Suite 700

HERNDON, VA. 20171

(571) 323-5200

Page: 11 of 56

Type: Regular

Employee Pay Checks From May 1, 2020 To Apr 22, 2021

Pay Date: Jul 10, 2020

Check/Advice #: 3009805

Control Number	Employee	Pay Period Start Date	Pay Period End Date	Advice Number
AK012225	SAYAD, RAOOF A.	Jun 21, 2020	Jul 4, 2020	3009805

Earnings	Hours	Amount	Year to Date
V - Spot Bonus/Recognition Awa	0.00	1200.00	2400.00
V - Regular	0.00	0.00	35584.00
V - Overtime	0.00	0.00	1080.00
Doubletime	0.00	0.00	256.00
V - Life Group Term Excess	0.00	0.00	8.82

Deduction	Amount	Year to Date
HSA Emp & Family	0.00	0.00
Medical Spousal Surcharge	0.00	648.10
V - 401(K)	144.00	4719.52
V - Dental Family	0.00	682.78
V Life Group Term - Excess Lif	0.00	8.82
V - Medical Emp + Family	0.00	2762.62
V - Vision Employee + Family	0.00	150.64

	Gross	Fed. Tax	Soc. Sec.	Medicare	AEIC	State Tax	Other Tax	Deductions	Net Pay
Current	1200.00	11.37	74.40	17.40	0.00	16.71	12.00	144.00	924.12
Year to Date	39328.82	1728.78	2175.34	508.80	0.00	1138.49	350.87	8970.48	24456.06

Direct Deposit				
Routing Number	Bank Name	Account Number	Account Type	Account Amount
	USAA Federal Savings Bank		Checking	924.12

Earnings	Hours	Hourly Rate	Additional Amount
V - Spot Bonus/Recognition Awa	0.00	32.0000	0.00

Exhibit 3

Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC

2553 Dulles View Dr, Suite 700

HERNDON, VA. 20171

(571) 323-5200

Page: 13 of 56

Type: Regular

Employee Pay Checks From May 1, 2020 To Apr 22, 2021

Pay Date: Jul 10, 2020

Check/Advice #: 3009785

Control Number	Employee	Pay Period Start Date	Pay Period End Date	Advice Number
AK012225	SAYAD, RAOOF A.	Jun 21, 2020	Jul 4, 2020	3009785

Earnings	Hours	Amount	Year to Date
V - Regular	72.00	2304.00	35584.00
V - Overtime	8.00	384.00	1080.00
V - Life Group Term Excess	0.00	0.63	8.82
V - Spot Bonus/Recognition Awa	0.00	0.00	2400.00
Doubletime	0.00	0.00	256.00

Deduction	Amount	Year to Date
HSA Emp & Family	0.00	0.00
Medical Spousal Surcharge	46.15	646.10
V - 401(K)	322.64	4719.52
V - Dental Family	48.77	682.78
V Life Group Term - Excess Lif	0.63	8.82
V - Medical Emp + Family	197.33	2762.62
V - Vision Employee + Family	10.76	150.64

	Gross	Fed. Tax	Soc. Sec.	Medicare	AEIC	State Tax	Other Tax	Deductions	Net Pay
Current	2688.63	119.29	147.91	34.59	0.00	76.82	23.86	626.28	1659.88
Year to Date	39328.82	1728.78	2175.34	508.80	0.00	1138.49	350.87	8970.48	24456.06

Direct Deposit				
Routing Number	Bank Name	Account Number	Account Type	Account Amount
	USAA Federal Savings Bank		Checking	1659.88

Earnings	Hours	Hourly Rate	Additional Amount
V - Overtime	8.00	48.0000	0.00
V - Regular	72.00	32.0000	0.00

Exhibit 4

Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC
Employee Earnings Report

Page 57 of 79
05/09/21
10:25 PM

Check Detail
Pay Cycle: PEG1 (From: 02/01/17 To: 05/07/21)

Home Organization: 208.231.306.02	Paycheck Type: R	Voided:	No
Employee Name: SAYAD, RAOOF A	Check Number: 3009785	Ref Check Number:	
Employee: AK012225	Check Date: 07/10/20	Ref Check Date:	

Hours:	80.00 Medicare Exempt PT:	0.00 SUTA State:	CA
Labor Amount:	2,688.63 Medicare Exempt Ded:	303.01 SUTA Exempt PT:	0.00
Earnings Amount:	2,688.63 Medicare Taxable:	2,385.62 SUTA Exempt Ded:	257.49
Reimbursements:	0.00 Medicare Withholding:	34.59 SUTA Subject Wage:	2,431.14
Gross Pay:	2,688.63 Addtl Medicare Taxable:	0.00 SUTA Excess Wage:	2,431.14
	Addtl Mdcr Withholding:	0.00 SUTA Taxable:	0.00
Federal Exempt PT:	0.00 Medicare Accrued:	34.59 SUTA Accrued:	0.00
Federal Exempt Ded:	625.65		
Federal Taxable:	2,062.98 Soc Sec Exempt PT:	0.00 Deductions:	626.28
Federal Withholding:	119.29 Soc Sec Exempt Ded:	303.01 Contributions:	910.52
	Soc Sec Taxable:	2,385.62	
FUTA Exempt PT:	0.00 Soc Sec Withholding:	147.91 Work Comp Hours:	80.00
FUTA Exempt Ded:	257.49 Soc Sec Accrued:	147.91 Work Comp Labor:	2,688.00
FUTA Subject Wage:	2,431.14	Work Comp Earnings:	2,560.00
FUTA Taxable:	0.00 State Withholding:	76.82	
FUTA Accrued:	0.00 Local Withholding:	23.86 NET PAY:	1,659.88

Pay Type/Wrk Cmp	Code	State	Hours	Labor Amount	Earnings Amount	Ded/Cont	Code	Amount
Pay Type	VLG		0.00	0.63	0.63	Deduction	HSAEF	0.00
Pay Type	VO		8.00	384.00	384.00	Deduction	SPSUR	46.15
Pay Type	VR		72.00	2,304.00	2,304.00	Deduction	V401K	322.64
Workers' Comp	7428	CA	80.00	2,688.00	2,560.00	Deduction	VDEF	48.77
						Deduction	VLGTL	0.63
						Deduction	VMEF	197.33
						Deduction	VVISEF	10.76
						Contribution	HSAEF	250.00
						Contribution	VADD	0.47
						Contribution	VDEF	20.79
						Contribution	VLIFE	1.89
						Contribution	VLTD	5.40
						Contribution	VMEF	622.05
						Contribution	VSTD	9.92

Withholding Type	Code	Exempt Pay Types	Exempt Deductions	Taxable Wages	Withholding	Accrued Expenses
State Tax	CA	0.00	625.65	2,062.98	76.82	
Local Tax	CADI	0.00	303.01	2,385.62	23.86	

Exhibit 5

LAW OFFICES
MAYALL HURLEY

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA OFFICE
450 N. BRAND BLVD., SUITE 600
GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA 91203
(818) 646-6440

2453 GRAND CANAL BOULEVARD
STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA 95207-8253

FAX (209) 473-4818

TELEPHONE (209) 477-3833

WWW.MAYALLLAW.COM

VLADIMIR F. KOZINA
STEVEN A. MALCOUN
MARK E. BERRY
WILLIAM J. GORHAM III
NICHOLAS F. SCARDIGLI
ROBERT J. WASSERMAN
JENNY D. BAYSINGER
JOHN P. BRISCOE
VLADIMIR J. KOZINA
RACHAEL ALLGAIER

OF COUNSEL
J. ANTHONY ABBOTT

MAILING ADDRESS:
2453 GRAND CANAL BLVD.
STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA 95207

May 18, 2021

SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Suite 801
Oakland, California 94612

SENT VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC
3901 Old International Airport Rd.
Anchorage, AK 99502

Re: Raoof Abdul Sayad

To whom it may concern:

This firm represents Raoof Abdul Sayad ("Sayad") in connection with his former employment with Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC. In accordance with California Labor Code section 2699.3, this letter shall serve as Sayad's written notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC regarding the following violations, and facts and theories supporting those violations, on Sayad's behalf and, as a proxy for the LWDA, on behalf of current and other former California employees of Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC.

Sayad was hired by Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC as an Aircraft Maintenance Technician to work at the Stockton Airport in Stockton, California. At all times relevant herein, Sayad was properly classified and paid as a nonexempt, hourly employee.

Though Sayad worked and earned overtime, Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC failed to pay his accrued overtime at the appropriate rate of pay, resulting in an underpayment of wages. Sayad earned and was paid nondiscretionary bonuses for good performance. For example, during the pay period of June 21 – July 4, 2020, Sayad earned a nondiscretionary bonus in the amount of \$1,200. (Exhibit A.) However, and though Sayad worked overtime during this pay period, Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC failed to incorporate the value of this earned nondiscretionary bonus into Sayad's "regular rate of pay" for purposes of calculating and paying overtime wages;

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC
Re: Raoof Abdul Sayad
May 18, 2021
Page 2 of 3

instead, it merely took Sayad's base hourly rate of \$32 and multiplied it by 1.5. (**Exhibit B.**) Accordingly, Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC violated Labor Code section 510.

Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC also failed to provide paid sick days to its California employees, in accordance with the Labor Code. Sayad's wage statements did not show any accrued paid sick days or paid time off, and he was not provided with any separate writing showing such. Thus, Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC violated Labor Code section 246(i). On information and belief, Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC did not provide its California employees with paid sick days or paid time off in accordance with Labor Code section 246. To the extent that it did, and on information and belief, Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC did not provide its California employees with paid sick days or paid time off at the appropriate "regular rate of pay", accounting for the value of earned nondiscretionary bonuses and other items of compensation, in violation of Labor Code sections 233 and 246.

Because Sayad was not paid overtime at the appropriate rate, *supra*, the itemized wage statements issued to him failed to accurately show the gross wages earned, net wages earned, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each rate, in violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivisions (a)(1), (5), and (9), respectively.

Additionally, Sayad was denied rest and meal periods to which he was entitled. Sayad was *never* relieved of all duty and authorized and permitted to take an uninterrupted, ten-minute rest period. Further, and while he typically received meal periods, they were not authorized and permitted until Sayad had already worked six hours or more. Sayad was not paid an hour of pay at his regular rate of compensation for every rest and meal period not provided. Accordingly, Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC violated Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512.

Last, Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC failed to maintain complete and accurate payroll records, as required by the Labor Code. On May 18, 2021, and following request by the undersigned, Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC produced a copy of Sayad's "Employee Earnings Reports"—computerized summaries of Sayad's earnings. (**Exhibit C.**) However, each of these reports fail to show the inclusive dates of the pay period for which Sayad was paid, the address of the legal entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each rate, in violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivisions (a)(6), (8), and (9), respectively. By failing to keep on file either copies of Sayad's wage statements or a computer-generated record, accurately showing all information required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC committed a further violation of section 226(a).

Sayad's employment with Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC ended on or around April 20, 2021. However, at no point has Sayad been paid the full balance of unpaid overtime wages, accrued paid sick time, and premium payments for rest/meal break violations, *supra*. Accordingly, Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC violated Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC
Re: Raoof Abdul Sayad
May 18, 2021
Page 3 of 3

The foregoing violations, and each of them, were committed as against other employees of Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC in California, and within the last year.


If the LWDA believes that it needs additional information to determine whether to investigate these claims, please contact me immediately to request the additional information, which I will provide to the extent it is available to me or my client.

If the LWDA does not intend to investigate these violations, Sayad intends to file a civil complaint against Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (Labor Code, § 2698 *et seq.*), on his behalf and, as a proxy for the LWDA, on behalf of all aggrieved current and former employees. Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Sincerely,

MAYALL HURLEY P.C.

By


JOHN P. BRISCOE

Enclosures
CC: Heather Hearne (email)

Exhibit A

Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC

2553 Dulles View Dr, Suite 700

HERNDON, VA. 20171

(571) 323-5200

Page: 11 of 56

Type: Regular

Employee Pay Checks From May 1, 2020 To Apr 22, 2021

Pay Date: Jul 10, 2020

Check/Advice #: 3009805

Control Number	Employee	Pay Period Start Date	Pay Period End Date	Advice Number
AK012225	SAYAD, RAOOF A.	Jun 21, 2020	Jul 4, 2020	3009805

Earnings	Hours	Amount	Year to Date
V - Spot Bonus/Recognition Awa	0.00	1200.00	2400.00
V - Regular	0.00	0.00	35584.00
V - Overtime	0.00	0.00	1080.00
Doubletime	0.00	0.00	256.00
V - Life Group Term Excess	0.00	0.00	8.82

Deduction	Amount	Year to Date
HSA Emp & Family	0.00	0.00
Medical Spousal Surcharge	0.00	646.10
V - 401(K)	144.00	4719.52
V - Dental Family	0.00	682.78
V Life Group Term - Excess Lif	0.00	8.82
V - Medical Emp + Family	0.00	2762.62
V - Vision Employee + Family	0.00	150.64

	Gross	Fed. Tax	Soc. Sec.	Medicare	AEIC	State Tax	Other Tax	Deductions	Net Pay
Current	1200.00	11.37	74.40	17.40	0.00	16.71	12.00	144.00	924.12
Year to Date	39328.82	1728.78	2175.34	508.80	0.00	1138.49	350.87	8970.48	24456.06

Direct Deposit				
Routing Number	Bank Name	Account Number	Account Type	Account Amount
	USAA Federal Savings Bank		Checking	924.12

Earnings	Hours	Hourly Rate	Additional Amount
V - Spot Bonus/Recognition Awa	0.00	32.0000	0.00

17 FEB 1971

Exhibit B

Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC

2553 Dulles View Dr, Suite 700

HERNDON, VA. 20171

(571) 323-5200

Page: 13 of 56

Type: Regular

Employee Pay Checks From May 1, 2020 To Apr 22, 2021

Pay Date: Jul 10, 2020

Check/Advice #: 3009785

Control Number	Employee	Pay Period Start Date	Pay Period End Date	Advice Number
AK012225	SAYAD, RAOOF A.	Jun 21, 2020	Jul 4, 2020	3009785

Earnings	Hours	Amount	Year to Date
V - Regular	72.00	2304.00	35584.00
V - Overtime	8.00	384.00	1080.00
V - Life Group Term Excess	0.00	0.63	8.82
V - Spot Bonus/Recognition Awa	0.00	0.00	2400.00
Doubletime	0.00	0.00	256.00

Deduction	Amount	Year to Date
HSA Emp & Family	0.00	0.00
Medical Spousal Surcharge	46.15	646.10
V - 401(K)	322.64	4719.52
V - Dental Family	48.77	682.78
V Life Group Term - Excess Lif	0.63	8.82
V - Medical Emp + Family	197.33	2762.62
V - Vision Employee + Family	10.76	150.64

	Gross	Fed. Tax	Soc. Sec.	Medicare	AEIC	State Tax	Other Tax	Deductions	Net Pay
Current	2688.63	119.29	147.91	34.59	0.00	76.82	23.86	626.28	1659.88
Year to Date	39328.82	1728.78	2175.34	508.80	0.00	1138.49	350.87	8970.48	24456.06

Direct Deposit				
Routing Number	Bank Name	Account Number	Account Type	Account Amount
	USAA Federal Savings Bank		Checking	1659.88

Earnings	Hours	Hourly Rate	Additional Amount
V - Overtime	8.00	48.0000	0.00
V - Regular	72.00	32.0000	0.00

Exhibit C

Pegasus Aviation Services, LLC

Employee Earnings Report

Page 57 of 79
05/09/21
10:25 PM

Check Detail
Pay Cycle: PEG1 (From: 02/01/17 To: 05/07/21)

Home Organization: 208.231.306.02	Paycheck Type: R	Voided:	No
Employee Name: SAYAD, RAOOF A	Check Number: 3009785	Ref Check Number:	
Employee: AK012225	Check Date: 07/10/20	Ref Check Date:	

Hours:	80.00	Medicare Exempt PT:	0.00	SUTA State:	CA
Labor Amount:	2,688.63	Medicare Exempt Ded:	303.01	SUTA Exempt PT:	0.00
Earnings Amount:	2,688.63	Medicare Taxable:	2,385.62	SUTA Exempt Ded:	257.49
Reimbursements:	0.00	Medicare Withholding:	34.59	SUTA Subject Wage:	2,431.14
Gross Pay:	2,688.63	Addtl Medicare Taxable:	0.00	SUTA Excess Wage:	2,431.14
		Addtl Mdcr Withholding:	0.00	SUTA Taxable:	0.00
Federal Exempt PT:	0.00	Medicare Accrued:	34.59	SUTA Accrued:	0.00
Federal Exempt Ded:	625.65				
Federal Taxable:	2,062.98	Soc Sec Exempt PT:	0.00	Deductions:	626.28
Federal Withholding:	119.29	Soc Sec Exempt Ded:	303.01	Contributions:	910.52
		Soc Sec Taxable:	2,385.62		
FUTA Exempt PT:	0.00	Soc Sec Withholding:	147.91	Work Comp Hours:	80.00
FUTA Exempt Ded:	257.49	Soc Sec Accrued:	147.91	Work Comp Labor:	2,688.00
FUTA Subject Wage:	2,431.14			Work Comp Earnings:	2,560.00
FUTA Taxable:	0.00	State Withholding:	76.82		
FUTA Accrued:	0.00	Local Withholding:	23.86	NET PAY:	1,659.88

Pay Type/Wrk Cmp	Code	State	Hours	Labor Amount	Earnings Amount	Ded/Cont	Code	Amount
Pay Type	VLG		0.00	0.63	0.63	Deduction	HSAEF	0.00
Pay Type	VO		8.00	384.00	384.00	Deduction	SPSUR	46.15
Pay Type	VR		72.00	2,304.00	2,304.00	Deduction	V401K	322.64
Workers' Comp	7428	CA	80.00	2,688.00	2,560.00	Deduction	VDEF	48.77
						Deduction	VLGTL	0.63
						Deduction	VMEF	197.33
						Deduction	VVISEF	10.76
						Contribution	HSAEF	250.00
						Contribution	VADD	0.47
						Contribution	VDEF	20.79
						Contribution	VLIFE	1.89
						Contribution	VLTD	5.40
						Contribution	VMEF	622.05
						Contribution	VSTD	9.92

Withholding Type	Code	Exempt Pay Types	Exempt Deductions	Taxable Wages	Withholding	Accrued Expenses
State Tax	CA	0.00	625.65	2,062.98	76.82	
Local Tax	CADI	0.00	303.01	2,385.62	23.86	

Pegasus/Sayad_000058