

Justin F. Marquez (SBN 262417)
justin@wilshirelawfirm.com
 Benjamin H. Haber (SBN 315664)
benjamin@wilshirelawfirm.com
 Arrash T. Fattahi (SBN 333676)
afattahi@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
 3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor
 Los Angeles, California 90010
 Telephone: (213) 381-9988
 Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

LABRI J. MELZER, on behalf of the State of
 California and other aggrieved persons,

Plaintiff,

vs.

D. LONGO, LLC, a California Limited Liability
 Company; PENSKE MOTOR GROUP, LLC, a
 California Limited Liability Company; and
 DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **21PSCV01025**

**PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
 COMPLAINT:**

1. Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab.
 Code § 2699, et seq.]

1 Plaintiff Labri J. Melzer (“Plaintiff”), based upon facts that either have evidentiary
2 support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further
3 investigation and discovery, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendant D. LONGO, LLC, Defendant
6 PENSKE MOTOR GROUP, LLC, and DOES 1 through 10 (D. LONGO, LLC, PENSKE
7 MOTOR GROUP, LLC, and DOES 1 through 10 are collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for
8 civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code §§ 2698
9 *et seq.* (“PAGA”) stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay for all hours worked (minimum,
10 straight time, and overtime wages), failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and
11 permit rest periods, failure to pay all earned wages twice per month, failure to maintain accurate
12 records of hours worked and meal periods, failure to timely pay final wages, and failure to
13 furnish accurate wage statements.

14 2. For over 50 years, California’s courts and legislature have recognized that this
15 State’s wage-and-hour laws serve a compelling public interest of fostering a stable job market.
16 Wages are not ordinary debts. Because of the economic position of the average worker and his
17 or her family, it is essential to the public welfare that employers obey the wage-and-hour laws so
18 that employees are promptly paid the minimum/overtime wages that the Legislature has required
19 for employees. So fundamental are California’s wage-and-hour laws that the Legislature has
20 criminalized certain types of violations. In extending extra protection to deter violations of these
21 underlying statutes—since Plaintiff is not seeking general and/or special damages, restitution or
22 other damages other than civil penalties—California has enacted the PAGA to permit an
23 individual to bring an action for PAGA penalties only, which is the precise and sole nature of this
24 action.

25 3. All California employees during the relevant statutes of limitations who are or
26 were harmed by Defendants’ illegal practices are “Aggrieved Employees.” The Aggrieved
27 Employees worked for Defendants as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the
28 applicable statutory period.

1 4. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants seeking only to recover penalties on
2 behalf of all Aggrieved Employees that worked for Defendants, and on behalf of the State of
3 California. Plaintiff does not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by
4 California Labor Code Section 2699 at this time. To the extent that statutory violations are
5 mentioned for wage violations, Plaintiff does not seek underlying general and/or special damages
6 for those violations, but simply penalties as permitted by California Labor Code Section 2699,
7 declaratory relief, and injunctive relief for herself and all Aggrieved Employees as permitted by
8 the PAGA.

9 5. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
10 establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. As such, and based
11 upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants
12 are subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare
13 Commission ("IWC"), and the California Business & Professions Code.

14 6. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and
15 constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their
16 unlawful policies. Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were
17 willful and deliberate.

18 7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the
19 unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the
20 foregoing paragraphs as the employers of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. Further,
21 Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under
22 the doctrine of "respondeat superior".

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

8. Plaintiff is a resident of Los Angeles County, California who worked for Defendants in El Monte, California from approximately July 2019 to approximately October 2020.¹

B. Defendants

9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendants D. LONGO, LLC and PENSKE MOTOR GROUP, LLC are, and at all times herein mentioned, were:

- (a) Business entities qualified to do business and actually conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Los Angeles County; and,
- (b) The former employers of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employers of the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants D. LONGO, LLC and PENSKE MOTOR GROUP, LLC suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

10. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

11. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of,

¹ In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Judicial Council of California adopted Emergency Rule 9(a) (California Rules of Court), whereby “statutes of limitations and repose for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are tolled from April 6, 2020 to October 1, 2020.

1 and/or injured a significant number of the Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in the State of
2 California.

3 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times
4 each Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and
5 the other employees and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions.
6 Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, each Defendant
7 was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director, controlling shareholder,
8 subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or predecessor in interest of
9 some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other Defendants in
10 a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the other
11 Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below. Plaintiff
12 is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the
13 scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have known about,
14 and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other
15 Defendants.

16 **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

17 13. Plaintiff Labri J. Melzer worked for Defendants in El Monte, California from
18 approximately July 2019 to approximately October 2020. At all times, Defendants paid Plaintiff
19 an hourly wage and classified her as non-exempt from overtime.

20 14. Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendants committed numerous labor code
21 violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendants
22 was typical and illustrative.

23 **A. Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Minimum, Straight Time,**
24 **and Overtime Wages**

25 15. Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee.
26 "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer,
27 and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required
28 to do so.

1 16. Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed
2 more than eight hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive
3 additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

4 17. Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not
5 be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation
6 beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states
7 that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the IWC is unlawful.

8 18. Additionally, pursuant to IWC Wage Order 7-2001(3)(D), “employee[s] whose
9 earnings exceed one and one-half (1 1/2) times the minimum wage if more than half of that
10 employee’s compensation represents commissions” in a particular pay period are exempt from
11 overtime pay.

12 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of
13 not paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum,
14 straight time, and overtime wages. Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
15 to work “off-the-clock,” uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
16 Employees to work during legally required meal periods and after their work shifts ended. Some
17 of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours
18 worked, Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the
19 Aggrieved Employees worked.

20 20. Further, Defendants failed to properly comply with IWC Wage Order 7-
21 2001(3)(D) which frequently resulted in Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees being
22 undercompensated. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were regularly not provided with
23 overtime pay when less than half of their earnings were represented by commissions, or their
24 earnings did not exceed 1.5 times the applicable minimum wage. As such, Defendants’ policy
25 and practice was not to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved with overtime pay when mandated by
26 California law.

27 21. Defendants also wrongfully failed to include non-discretionary bonuses,
28 commissions, incentive pay, production pay, performance pay, and/or shift differentials in the

1 calculation of Plaintiff's and the other Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay used to
2 calculate their overtime rate for the payment of overtime wages. Plaintiff and the other
3 Aggrieved Employees earned non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, incentive pay, production
4 pay, performance pay, and/or shift differentials and overtime wages in the same pay period where
5 they worked overtime hours. Accordingly, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the
6 Aggrieved Employees for all overtime compensation they were owed.

7 **B. Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

8 22. Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve
9 employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than
10 the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-
11 minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday.
12 Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they
13 were not provided with all required meal period(s).

14 23. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff
15 and the Aggrieved Employees with their legally mandated 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-
16 free meal period. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees routinely worked through meal periods
17 "off-the-clock," and Defendants frequently paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees less than
18 all their work time. Much of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In
19 failing to pay for all hours worked, Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of the
20 hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked. Defendants also regularly, but not always,
21 required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a
22 day without providing a 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period for every five hours
23 of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that
24 were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Instead,
25 Defendants continued to assert control over Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring,
26 pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without
27 working in lieu of taking mandatory meal periods, or by denying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
28 Employees permission to take a meal period. Defendants also never informed Plaintiff of her

1 right to, nor permitted her to take, a second meal period when Plaintiff worked at least ten hours
2 of work in a workday. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was not to provide meal
3 periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

4 24. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of
5 additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s).
6 Defendants, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the
7 additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods that were not provided.

8 **C. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods**

9 25. Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of ten
10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than
11 two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six hours and ten minutes, the
12 employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is
13 itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

14 26. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully failed to authorize and
15 permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest periods. Defendants
16 regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive
17 hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute,
18 uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four
19 hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that
20 were not authorized or permitted. Instead, Defendants continued to assert control over Plaintiff
21 and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work
22 tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods, or
23 by denying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a rest period.
24 Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiff and the
25 Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

26 27. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of
27 additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all
28 required rest period(s). Defendants, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved

1 Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were
2 not authorized and permitted to take.

3 **D. Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month**

4 28. Based on Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all
5 wages as discussed above, Defendants also violated Labor Code § 204.

6 29. Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two
7 times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action,
8 employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period
9 premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for overtime hours
10 worked. However, during all such times, Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay the
11 employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were
12 not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendants, all wages for all rest periods
13 not authorized and permitted by Defendants, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result,
14 Defendants owe employees the legally required wages not paid, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
15 Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

16 **E. Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods**

17 30. Plaintiff seeks penalties under California Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to
18 California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully
19 fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by California Labor Code § 1174 is
20 subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every
21 employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period.
22 Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded

23 31. Defendants, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all
24 meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

25 32. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records required by the California
26 Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to
27 know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of
28 their hours worked stated in Defendants' records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved

1 Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an
2 unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
3 Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and
4 enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking
5 to compel Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective
6 damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendants' knowing failure to
7 comply with the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the
8 Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing,
9 understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

10 **F. Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination**

11 33. Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee,
12 the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that
13 if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and
14 payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-
15 two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is
16 entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

17 34. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many
18 other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e., was terminated by quitting or being discharged, and the
19 employment of others will be terminated. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants
20 failed, and continue to fail to pay Plaintiff and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without
21 abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time
22 of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employment. These
23 unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum, straight time, and
24 overtime wages), missed meal period premium wages, and missed rest period premium wages.

25 35. Defendants' conduct violates Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Labor Code § 203
26 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201
27 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and
28 at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for

1 more than thirty (30) days.

2 36. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from
3 Defendants their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular
4 hourly rate of pay, up to thirty (30) days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

5 **G. Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

6 37. Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her
7 employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information,
8 including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of
9 piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis,
10 (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be
11 aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for
12 which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her
13 social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number,
14 (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly
15 rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each
16 hourly rate by the employee. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is
17 missing. (Labor Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

18 38. The statute further provides: “An employee suffering injury as a result of a
19 knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to
20 recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a
21 violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent
22 pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled
23 to an award of costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.” (Labor Code § 226(e)(1).)

24 39. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and the
25 Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly
26 rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages for meal
27 periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for rest
28 periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law).

40. Because Defendants violated Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights. Accordingly, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000) dollars per employee.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

**(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of
2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.)**

41. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

42. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the State of California and the applicable IWC Orders.

43. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this 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 specified in Section 2699.3.”

44. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3. On October 1, 2021, she gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and former Aggrieved Employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiff also paid the filing fee on October 1, 2021. Plaintiff’s PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-846973-21 (*Labri J. Melzer v. D. Longo, LLC, et al.*).

45. The statute of limitations is tolled while a plaintiff exhausts her administrative

remedies with California's LWDA prior to suit, which is required by the statute. (*See* Labor Code § 2699.3(d).)

46. The statute of limitations is also tolled from April 6, 2020 to October 1, 2020 pursuant to Rule 9(a) of the Emergency Rules Related to COVID-19.

47. More than sixty-five (65) days has elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice, but the LWDA has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants' Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

48. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of civil penalties on behalf of the State of California and similarly Aggrieved Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted by law.

49. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff, on behalf of all similarly aggrieved employees, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, failing to pay all earned wages twice per month, failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failing to timely pay final wages, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;

2. An award of civil penalties on behalf of herself and all similarly aggrieved employees pursuant to PAGA;


3. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate allowed;

- 1 4. Attorneys' fees and costs reasonably incurred;
2 5. Injunctive and declaratory relief to the extent allowed by PAGA; and,
3 6. Such other and further relief that the Court deems proper.

4
5 Respectfully submitted,

6 Dated: December 6, 2021

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

7
8 By: 

Justin F. Marquez
Benjamin H. Haber
Arrish T. Fattahi

9
10 Attorneys for Plaintiff Labri J. Melzer
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28