

Assigned for all purposes to: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Officer: Laura Seigle

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

David D. Bibiyan (SBN 287811)

david@tomorrowlaw.com

Malalai Anbari (SBN 304482)

malalai@tomorrowlaw.com

Sara Ehsani-Nia (SBN 326501)

sara@tomorrowlaw.com

8484 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 500

Beverly Hills, California 90211

Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

Attorneys for Plaintiff, CARLOS ENRIQUE PEREZ,
as an aggrieved employee, and on behalf of all other
aggrieved employees

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

CARLOS ENRIQUE PEREZ, as an aggrieved
employee, and on behalf of all other aggrieved
employees under the Labor Code Private
Attorneys' General Act of 2004,

Plaintiff,

v.

MIRACLE MILE HEALTHCARE CENTER,
LLC, a California limited liability company;
MIRACLE MILE POST ACUTE LLC, a
California limited liability company;
WESTSIDE HEALTH CARE, LLC, a
California limited liability company;
TRINITY NURSING HOME
MANAGEMENT, INC., a California
corporation; CPE HR, INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: **22STCV04088**

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

**COMPLAINT UNDER THE LABOR
CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS'
GENERAL ACT OF 2004 FOR CIVIL
PENALTIES UNDER LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1
and 2699**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

[Amount in Controversy Greater Than
\$25,000.00]

COMES NOW plaintiff CARLOS ENRIQUE PEREZ (“Plaintiff”), as aggrieved employees, and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees under the Labor Code Private Attorneys’ General Act of 2004, and alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This is a representative action, pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”), against MIRACLE MILE HEALTHCARE CENTER, LLC, a California limited liability company, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California (“Miracle Mile”), MIRACLE MILE POST ACUTE LLC, a California limited liability company, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California (“Post Acute”), WESTSIDE HEALTH CARE, LLC, a California limited liability company, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California (“Westside”), TRINITY NURSING HOME MANAGEMENT, INC., a California corporation, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California (“Trinity”), CPE HR, INC. (“CPE HR” and collectively with Miracle Mile, Post Acute, Westside, Trinity, and DOES 1 through 100, as further defined below, “Defendants”), as a proxy of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the State of California (“LWDA”), on behalf of Plaintiff and all other current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants working within the Civil Penalty Period, as further defined herein, and, as it pertains to the alleged claims for failure to comply with Labor Code section 2810.5, Labor Code section 203, Labor Code section 226, Labor Code section 227.3, Labor Code section 246, *et seq.*, Labor Code section 2802, restraints on competition, whistleblowing and freedom of speech on behalf of all employees of Defendants working within the Civil Penalty Period (collectively, “Aggrieved Employees”).

2. Jurisdiction exists in the Superior Court of the State of California pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 410.10.

3. Venue is proper in Los Angeles County, California pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure sections 392, *et seq.* because, among other things, Los Angeles County is where the causes of action complained of herein arose; the county in which the employment relationship

1 began; the county in which performance of the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff
2 and Defendants was due to be performed; the county in which the employment contract, or part of
3 it, between Plaintiff and Defendants was actually performed; and the county in which Defendants,
4 or some of them, reside. Moreover, the unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff
5 and Aggrieved Employees in Los Angeles County, and because Defendants employ numerous
6 Aggrieved Employees in Los Angeles County.

7 4. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” under PAGA, as Plaintiff was employed by
8 Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code
9 violations set forth herein. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties, as the term “civil
10 penalty” is defined under *ZB N.A. v. Superior Court* (2019) 8 Cal.5th 175, under the Labor Code
11 Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) plus
12 reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, for Plaintiff and all other aggrieved current and former
13 employees of Defendants during the Civil Penalty Period.

14 5. Specifically, Plaintiff seeks to recover PAGA civil penalties through a representative
15 action permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in, among other authorities, *Arias v.*
16 *Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969. According to the same authorities, class certification of the
17 PAGA allegations described herein is not required.

18 6. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding the provision of notice to the
19 LWDA regarding the herein-described Labor Code violations (the “Civil Penalty Period”),
20 Defendants violated, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 96, 98.6, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226,
21 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 232, 232.5, 246, *et seq.*, 432, 510, 512, 558, 1102.5, 1174, 1174.5, 1194, 1197,
22 1197.1, 1197.5, 1198.5, 2699, 2802, and 2810.5, among others.

23 7. Labor Code section 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g), authorizes aggrieved employees
24 such as Plaintiff, on behalf of Plaintiff and all other aggrieved current and former employees within
25 the statutory period, to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures
26 specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

27 8. On or around November 29, 2021, Plaintiff provided written notice pursuant to Labor
28 Code section 2699.3 online and by certified mail, with return receipt requested, of Defendants’

1 violation of various, including the herein-described, provisions of the Labor Code, to the LWDA,
2 as well as by certified mail, with return receipt requested to Defendants, and each of them.

3 9. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a)(2)(A), the LWDA did not
4 provide notice of its intention to investigate Defendants' alleged violations within sixty-five (65)
5 calendar days of the November 29, 2021 postmarked date of the herein-described notice sent by
6 Plaintiff to the LWDA and Defendants.

7 **PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ALLEGATIONS**

8 10. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
9 of failing to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in the State of
10 California in violation of California state wage and hour laws as a result of, without limitation,
11 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees working over eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per
12 week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek without paying them proper overtime
13 wages, as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually
14 worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without
15 limitation, by requiring employees: to remain on-call, to suffer under Defendants' control to
16 complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out (including
17 answering calls from dispatch and others), to clock out for meal periods and continue working, to
18 don and doff uniforms and/or safety equipment off the clock, to attend company meetings off the
19 clock, to make phone calls or drive off the clock; failing to include all forms of remuneration,
20 including non-discretionary bonuses, incentive pay, meal allowances, and other forms of
21 remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the pay periods where overtime was worked and the
22 additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay;
23 detrimental rounding of employee time entries, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show
24 less hours than actually worked, and for paying straight pay instead of overtime pay, to come early
25 to work and leave work late without being able to clock in for all that time, and/or go through
26 security screenings and/or temperature checks off the clock, and to suffer under Employer's control
27 due to long lines for clocking in, to the detriment of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees.

28 ///

1 11. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a practice or policy
2 of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with minimum wages for all hours
3 worked or otherwise under Defendants' control as a result of, without limitation, failing to
4 accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; by requiring employees: to remain on-
5 call; to suffer under Defendants' control to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift
6 tasks after clocking out (including answering calls from dispatch and others), to clock out for meal
7 periods and continue working, to don and doff uniforms and/or safety equipment off the clock, to
8 attend company meetings off the clock, to make phone calls or drive off the clock; detrimental
9 rounding of employee time entries, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours
10 than actually worked; failing to pay reporting time pay; paid time off and vacation time owed; by
11 requiring employees: to come early to work and leave work late without being able to clock in for
12 all that time, to suffer under Employer's control due to long lines for clocking in, and failing to pay
13 split shift premiums, to the detriment of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees.

14 12. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
15 of failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees a thirty (30) minute uninterrupted,
16 timely, and complete meal period for days on which the employee worked in excess of five (5) and
17 ten (10) hours per day without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal
18 periods or compensation in lieu thereof including, without limitation, by interrupting meal periods;
19 not providing timely meal periods; failing to provide first and second meal periods; providing short
20 meal periods; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during meal
21 periods; not permitting employees to leave the premises; otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call meal
22 periods; and/or auto-deducting meal periods that could not be auto-deducted by law or during which
23 employees worked, as required by California wage and hour laws

24 13. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
25 of failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees paid, uninterrupted, timely, and
26 complete rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes per four (4) hours worked or major fractions
27 thereof, or compensation in lieu thereof, including, without limitation, by failing to provide rest
28 periods all together; requiring that they be bundled together and/or with meal periods; interrupting

1 them; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during rest periods not
2 providing them in a timely fashion; and not permitting employees to leave the premises; and/or
3 otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call rest periods, as required by California wage and hour laws.

4 14. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
5 of failing to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish
6 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross
7 wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; all deductions; all applicable
8 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each
9 hourly rate by the employee; the legal name of the employer and/or the name and address of the legal
10 entity securing the employer's services if the employer is a farm labor contractor; and other such
11 information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

12 15. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
13 of failing to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish
14 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with documents signed to obtain or hold employment
15 under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records
16 under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to
17 calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments, to the detriment of Plaintiffs and other
18 Aggrieved Employees.

19 16. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
20 of failing to timely pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, among other wages, all wages
21 owed as a result of Defendants' practice or policy of failing to pay, among other wages, overtime
22 wages, minimum wages, premium wages, paid time off and vacation time owed as required by Labor
23 Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

24 17. At all relevant times herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing
25 to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees their paid time off and vacation time owed upon
26 separation of employment as wages at their final rate of pay in violation of Labor Code section 227.3
27 and applicable Wage Orders.

28 ///

1 18. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
2 failing and refusing, and continue to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without
3 limitation, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for driving personal
4 vehicles (*i.e.*, mileage and gas), purchasing uniforms, providing uniform and other deposits,
5 separately laundering mandatory uniforms, for the purchase of tools and safety equipment (including
6 work boots to handle oil), for the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone
7 plans, in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions
8 of Defendants, as required by Labor Code 2802.

9 19. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
10 failing to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft
11 Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
12 Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment;
13 allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage; the regular payday designated by Defendants; the
14 name, address, and telephone number of the workers' compensation insurance carrier; information
15 regarding paid sick leave; and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Defendants
16 under Labor Code section 2810.5.

17 20. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and
18 other Aggrieved Employees with the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to
19 California law (including, without limitation Labor Code section 246, *et seq.*), and also did not
20 permit its use upon request as contemplated under California laws, to the detriment of Plaintiff and
21 all other Aggrieved Employees.

22 21. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
23 failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code
24 Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of
25 any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the
26 labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any
27 calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month."

28 ///

1 22. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
2 of preventing Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees from using or disclosing the skills, knowledge
3 and experience they obtained at Defendants for purposes of competing with Defendants, including,
4 without limitation, preventing Employees from disclosing their wages in negotiating a new job with
5 a prospective employer, and from disclosing who else works at Defendants and under what
6 circumstances that they might be receptive to an offer from a rival employer. Plaintiff is informed
7 and believes that this policy and/or practice violates Business and Professions Code sections 17200,
8 16600 and 16700, and, by virtue thereof, various provisions of the Labor Code, including Labor
9 Code sections 232, 232.5, and 1197.5, subdivision (k).

10 23. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of preventing Plaintiff and/or other
11 Aggrieved Employees from disclosing violations of state and federal law, either within Defendants
12 to their managers or outside to private attorneys or government officials, among others, in violation
13 of Business and Professions Code section 17200, and, thus, in violation of Labor Code section
14 1102.5. In addition, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' herein-described policies
15 and/or practices prevent Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees from disclosing information
16 about unsafe or discriminatory working conditions, or about wage and hour violations in violation
17 of Labor Code section 232 and 232.5.

18 24. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of preventing Plaintiff and/or other
19 Aggrieved Employees from engaging in lawful conduct during non-work hours, thus violating state
20 statutes entitling employees to disclose wages, working conditions, and illegal conduct, including,
21 without limitation, Labor Code sections 96, subdivision (k), 98.6, 232, 232.5, and 1197.5,
22 subdivision (k). Plaintiff is informed and believes that this lawful conduct includes the exercise of
23 Plaintiff's and/or other Aggrieved Employee's constitutional rights of freedom of speech and
24 economic liberty.

25 25. Plaintiff, in Plaintiff's representative capacity, seeks civil penalties under Labor
26 Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699 for the herein-described acts, which violate
27 the California Labor Code as described above, including on behalf of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
28 Employees pursuant to PAGA.

1 **PARTIES**

2 **A. Plaintiff**

3 26. Plaintiff is a resident of the State of California. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff
4 is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants employed Plaintiff CARLOS
5 ENRIQUE PEREZ as a non-exempt employee, with duties that included, but were not limited to,
6 stocking and managing food preparation. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon
7 alleges that Plaintiff CARLOS ENRIQUE PEREZ worked for Defendants from approximately
8 November of 1995 through approximately November 2020.

9 **B. Defendants**

10 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant Miracle
11 Mile is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing
12 under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of Los
13 Angeles, State of California.

14 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant Miracle
15 Mile Post Acute is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and
16 existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County
17 of Los Angeles, State of California.

18 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant Westside
19 is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and
20 by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of Los Angeles,
21 State of California.

22 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant Trinity is,
23 and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and
24 by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of Ventura, State
25 of California.

26 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant CPE HR
27 is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of

28 ///

1 the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of Los Angeles, State of
2 California.

3 32. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise,
4 of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff,
5 who therefore sues defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474.
6 Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the defendants designated
7 herein as DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein.
8 Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of
9 the defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known. Plaintiff is
10 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each defendant acted in all respects pertinent
11 to this action, as the agent of the other defendant(s), carried out a joint scheme, business plan or
12 policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally attributable to the
13 other defendants. Whenever, heretofore or hereinafter, reference is made to "Defendants," it shall
14 include Miracle Mile, Post Acute, Westside, Trinity, CPE HR, and any of their parent, subsidiary,
15 or affiliated companies within the State of California, as well as DOES 1 through 100 identified
16 herein.

17 **JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS**

18 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
19 mentioned herein, each of the defendants was the agent, principal, employee, employer,
20 representative, joint venture or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, either actually or
21 ostensibly, and in doing the things alleged herein acted within the course and scope of such agency,
22 employment, joint venture, and conspiracy.

23 34. All of the acts and conduct described herein of each and every corporate defendant
24 was duly authorized, ordered, and directed by the respective and collective defendant corporate
25 employers, and the officers and management-level employees of said corporate employers. In
26 addition thereto, said corporate employers participated in the aforementioned acts and conduct of
27 their said employees, agents, and representatives, and each of them; and upon completion of the
28 aforesaid acts and conduct of said corporate employees, agents, and representatives, the defendant

1 corporation respectively and collectively ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded,
2 acquiesced, authorized, and otherwise approved of each and all of the said acts and conduct of the
3 aforementioned corporate employees, agents and representatives.

4 35. As a result of the aforementioned facts, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based
5 thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are joint employers.

6 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **(Civil Penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act (2004) – Against All Defendants)**

8 36. Plaintiff re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs
9 and incorporates each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

10 37. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 204, requires and required that:
11 “[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for
12 between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor
13 performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for
14 between the 1st and 10th day of the following month.”

15 38. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a) states and stated
16 that “[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this
17 article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3,
18 204, 204b, 204.1, 205, 205.5, and 1197.5, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any
19 initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee” and “(2) For
20 each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for
21 each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.”

22 39. At all relevant times herein, Defendants have had a consistent policy or practice of
23 failing to pay Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees during their employment on a timely basis as
24 per Labor Code section 204. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 210, Plaintiff and other
25 Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants’ violations of Labor
26 Code section 204, in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee for
27 each initial violation per employee, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each Aggrieved Employee

28 ///

1 for each subsequent violation in connection with each payment that was made in violation of Labor
2 Code section 204.

3 Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 226.3

4 40. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing to comply with Labor Code
5 section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees
6 with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked; net
7 wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
8 number of hours worked at each hourly rate; and other such information as required by Labor Code
9 section 226, subdivision (a).

10 41. Labor Code section 226.3 states that “[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a)
11 of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250)
12 per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for
13 each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage
14 deduction statement or fails to keep the records required in subdivision (a) of Section 226.”

15 42. Labor Code section 226.3 further provides that “[t]he civil penalties provided for in
16 this section are in addition to any other penalty provided by law.”

17 43. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had
18 and have a policy or practice of failing to furnish non-exempt employees, including, without
19 limitation, Plaintiff, with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total
20 hours worked; net wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
21 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; and other such information as required
22 by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

23 44. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.3, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are
24 entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants’ violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision
25 (a) in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period
26 for the initial violation, and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay
27 period for each subsequent violation.

28 ///

1 Violation of Labor Code § 558

2 45. Pursuant to Labor Code section 558, subdivision (a): “Any employer or other person
3 acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated . . . any provision regulating
4 hours and days of work in any of the Industrial Welfare Commission” shall be subject to a civil
5 penalty as follows:

6 (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee and for each
7 pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient
8 to recover underpaid wages;

9 (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid
10 employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to
11 an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages;

12 (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee.”

13 Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants, and
14 each of them, violated, or caused to be violated, the Labor Code sections described
15 herein, including causing Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees not to: be paid
16 with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment,
17 allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the regular payday designated by
18 Defendants, the name of the employer, including any “doing business as” names
19 used, the name, address and telephone number of the workers’ compensation
20 insurance carrier, information regarding paid sick leave, and other pertinent
21 information.

22 46. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
23 pursuant to Labor Code section 558, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover
24 civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount fifty dollars
25 (\$50) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars
26 (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

27 ///

28 ///

1 Violation of Labor Code § 1174.5

2 47. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (b) has required
3 every person employing labor in California to “[a]llow any member of the commission or the
4 employees of the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement free access to the place of business or
5 employment of the person to secure any information or make any investigation that they are
6 authorized by this chapter to ascertain or make. The commission may inspect or make excerpts,
7 relating to the employment of employees, from the books, reports, contracts, payrolls, documents,
8 or papers of the person.”

9 48. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (c) has required
10 every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep a record showing the names and addresses of
11 all employees employed and the ages of all minors.”

12 49. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d) has required
13 every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep, at a central location in the state or at the
14 plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours
15 worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and applicable
16 piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records
17 shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any
18 case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee
19 from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units
20 earned.”

21 50. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, “[a]ny person employing labor who willfully
22 fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of [Labor Code] Section 1174 or accurate
23 and complete records required by subdivision (d) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, or to allow any
24 member of the commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to subdivision
25 (b) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).

26 51. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants have
27 willfully failed keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar
28 payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment

1 under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records
2 under Labor Code section 1174.

3 52. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
4 pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
5 recover civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of five
6 hundred dollars (\$500) per violation per Aggrieved Employee.

7 Violation of Labor Code § 1197.1

8 53. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, subdivision (a): "Any employer or other
9 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, who pays
10 or causes to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or
11 local law, or by an order of the commission shall be subject to a civil penalty, restitution of wages,
12 liquidated damages payable to the employee, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
13 Section 203 as follows:

14 (1) For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars
15 (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
16 employee is underpaid. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
17 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
18 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

19 (2) For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty
20 dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
21 employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is
22 intentionally committed. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
23 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
24 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

25 (3) Wages, liquidated damages, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
26 Section 203, recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected
27 employee."

28 ///

1 54. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants caused
2 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees not to be paid minimum wages as a result of Defendants, without
3 limitation, routinely failing to pay Plaintiff or other Aggrieved Employees' to pay minimum wages
4 for all hours worked, entitling Employee and other aggrieved employees to actual and liquidated
5 damages.

6 55. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
7 pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
8 recover civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount one
9 hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and
10 two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each
11 subsequent violation.

12 Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 2699

13 56. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), notwithstanding any other
14 provision of law, any provision of the Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed
15 and collected by the LWDA or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or
16 employees for a violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil
17 action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former
18 employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

19 57. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f), for all provisions of the Labor
20 Code except those for which a civil penalty is specifically provided, the established civil penalty for
21 a violation of those provisions is as follows: if, at the time of the alleged violation, the person
22 employs one or more employees, the civil penalty is one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved
23 employee per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved
24 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

25 58. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and
26 each of them, violated the Labor Code sections described herein, including, without limitation, for
27 the failure to: pay the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment,
28 allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the regular payday designated by Defendants, the

1 name of the employer, including any “doing business as” names used, the name, address and
2 telephone number of the workers’ compensation insurance carrier, information regarding paid sick
3 leave, and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Defendants under Labor Code
4 section 2810.5, failing to provide Employee and other aggrieved employees with the amount of paid
5 sick leave required to be provided pursuant to California and local laws.

6 59. Moreover, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees within the State of California
7 whom he seeks to represent are entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs in
8 connection with their herein-described claims for civil penalties.

9 **REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL**

10 60. Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury.

11 **PRAYER**

12 **WHEREFORE**, on behalf of Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff prays for
13 judgment against Defendants as follows:

- 14 A. An award of civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558,
15 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
- 16 B. An award of reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections
17 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
- 18 C. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;
- 19 D. For costs of suit incurred herein; and
- 20 E. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

21 Dated: February 2, 2022

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

22
23 BY: 
24 MALALAI ANBARI
25 DAVID D. BIBIYAN
26 Attorneys for Plaintiff CARLOS ENRIQUE
27 PEREZ, as an aggrieved employee, and on
28 behalf of all other aggrieved employees under
the Labor Code Private Attorneys’ General
Act of 2004,