

Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
kane.moon@moonyanglaw.com
Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan (SBN 320389)
lilit@moonyanglaw.com
MOON & YANG, APC
1055 W. Seventh St., Suite 1880
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 232-3128
Facsimile: (213) 232-3125

Attorneys for Plaintiff Mario Albert Hidalgo

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

MARIO ALBERT HIDALGO, individually, and
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SUNVAIR, INC., a Delaware corporation; and
DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants

Case No.: 21STCV41120

**FIRST AMENDED REPRESENTATIVE
ACTION COMPLAINT:**

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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
THE PARTIES	3
A. Plaintiff.....	3
B. Defendants.....	3
ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION	5
FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION	8
PRAYER FOR RELIEF	10
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	11

1 Plaintiff Mario Albert Hidalgo (“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 Defendants Sunvair, Inc. and Does 1 through 10
6 (Sunvair, Inc. and Does 1 through 10 are collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California
7 Labor Code violations and unfair business practices stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay
8 minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to
9 authorize and permit rest periods, failure to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal
10 periods, failure to timely pay all wages to terminated employees, failure to indemnify necessary
11 business expenses, and failure to furnish accurate wage statements.

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

23 3. All non-exempt California employees of Defendants beginning November 9, 2020
24 to the present, are “Aggrieved Employees.”

25 4. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants seeking only to recover penalties on
26 behalf of all Aggrieved Employees that worked for Defendants, and on behalf of the State of
27 California. Plaintiff does not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by
28 California Labor Code Section 2699 at this time. To the extent that statutory violations are

1 mentioned for wage violations, Plaintiff does not seek underlying general and/or special damages
2 for those violations, but simply penalties as permitted by California Labor Code Section 2699,
3 declaratory relief, and injunctive relief for himself and all aggrieved employees as permitted by
4 the PAGA.

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

10 6. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period Defendants
11 maintained a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 12 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum
13 wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code
14 and IWC Wage Orders;
- 15 (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in
16 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing
17 to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and
18 failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period
19 violation occurred;
- 20 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
21 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
22 Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a rest
23 period violation occurred;
- 24 (d) Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred;
- 25 (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, overtime wages,
26 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages due within
27 the time period specified by California law when employment terminates;
28 and

- (f) Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked.
- (g) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

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

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

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

9. Plaintiff is a California resident that worked for Defendants in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, from approximately 2000 to August 2021.

10. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v. American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

B. Defendants

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendant Sunvair, Inc. is:

- (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in Los Angeles, California.
- (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Los Angeles County; and
- (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer

of the Aggrieved Employees. Sunvair, Inc. suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

12. Plaintiff does not currently 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.

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

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

///

///

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

2 15. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of Los
3 Angeles, State of California, from approximately 2000 to August 2021. During the statutory
4 period, Defendants classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from California's overtime requirements,
5 and paid Plaintiff an hourly wage.

6 16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours
7 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with
8 uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take uninterrupted rest
9 periods, failed to indemnify Plaintiff for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all
10 final wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment, and failed to furnish
11 accurate wage statements to Plaintiff. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for
12 Defendants was typical and illustrative.

13 17. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of
14 not paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime
15 wages. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work "off the clock", and
16 uncompensated. For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to use his
17 cellular telephones while off the clock, such as receiving calls from Defendants regarding shifts
18 and work schedule. Further, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to expend
19 time to purchase items, such as tools, while off the clock and uncompensated. Further, Plaintiff
20 and the Aggrieved Employees received non-discretionary bonuses. However, Defendants failed
21 to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the correct overtime rate of pay, leading to
22 underpayment of wages. In maintaining a practice of not paying all wages owed, Defendants
23 failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

24 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to provide
25 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants
26 sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of
27 five consecutive hours a day without providing 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-
28 free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the

1 Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of
2 work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the
3 Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or,
4 for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Further, Defendants
5 automatically deducted meal periods, despite them being short regularly due to the fact that
6 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to walk to specified areas for their meal
7 periods. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to
8 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

9 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
10 and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods.
11 Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work
12 in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to
13 take a 10-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or
14 major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
15 for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendants also did not adequately inform
16 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendants
17 did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff and
18 the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendants have adequate policies or practices regarding the
19 timing of rest periods. Defendants also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify
20 whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further,
21 Defendants did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore
22 Defendants cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods
23 during the middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not
24 authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance
25 with California law.

26 20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and the
27 Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for
28 Defendants without reimbursement. For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were

1 required to use their personal cellular telephones for work, without full reimbursement. Further,
2 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to purchase items for work, such as tools
3 and masks, without reimbursement.

4 21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
5 pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees at the conclusion of their employment all wages for
6 all minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium
7 wages.

8 22. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and the
9 Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly
10 rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned
11 for hours worked, correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not
12 provided in accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not
13 authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and Defendant's address).
14 Further, the wage statements do not show Defendant's address as required by California law. As
15 a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
16 Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

- 17 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
18 minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest
19 period premium wages to which they were entitled, even though they were
20 entitled;
- 21 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum,
22 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even
23 though they had not been;
- 24 (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid
25 minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages
26 at the correct California rate even though they were;
- 27
28

- 1 (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime,
2 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct
3 California rate even though they had not been;
- 4 (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum,
5 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- 6 (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
7 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have
8 to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages
9 owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage
10 statements contained the required accurate information;
- 11 (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to
12 lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security,
13 disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;
- 14 (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages
15 rates to which Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled, and
16 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were paid less than the wages and
17 wage rates to which they were entitled.

18 Thus, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for in California
19 Labor Code § 226(e), including actual damages.

20 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of**
22 **2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.)**

23 23. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
24 paragraphs 1 through 22 in this First Amended Complaint.

25 24. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the
26 State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

27 25. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action
28 to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “Notwithstanding any other provision of

1 law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by
2 the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions,
3 commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative,
4 be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or
5 herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section
6 2699.3.”

7 26. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor
8 Code § 2699.3. On November 7, 2021, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor
9 and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific
10 provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and
11 former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. At the
12 time of this filing, 65 days has elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice, but the Labor and
13 Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’
14 Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil
15 action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of
16 the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to,
17 penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

18 27. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants’ violation of California Labor
19 Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity,
20 employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by
21 California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable
22 IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee
23 begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall also be
24 recorded. Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every employer shall
25 keep total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

26 28. During the time period of employment for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees,
27 Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the Labor Code and IWC Orders by failing to
28 maintain accurate records showing meal periods, and accurate records showing when employees

1 begin and end each work period. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records required by
2 the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to
3 know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of
4 their hours worked stated in Defendants' records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
5 Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an
6 unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
7 Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and
8 enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking
9 to compel Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective
10 damage in amounts according to proof at trial. Because of Defendants' knowing failure to
11 comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
12 Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing,
13 understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

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

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

22 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

23 Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, the State of California, and similarly Aggrieved
24 Employees, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

25 **As to the First Cause of Action**

26 1. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California
27 Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum, regular rate, and
28 overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal

1 periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, failing to maintain accurate records of all
2 hours worked and meal periods, failing to pay final wages at termination, and failing to furnish
3 accurate wage statements;

4 2. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, et seq., and all
5 other applicable Labor Code provisions;

6 3. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
7 California Labor Code § 2699;

8 For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate
9

10 Dated: February 7, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

11 MOON & YANG, APC

12
13 By:  _____

14 Kane Moon
Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan
Attorneys for Plaintiff

15
16
17 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

18 Plaintiff demands a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury.
19

20 Dated: February 7, 2022

MOON & YANG, APC

21 By:  _____

22 Kane Moon
Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan
Attorneys for Plaintiff
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

3 I am employed in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. I am over the age of 18 and not
4 a party to the within suit; my business address is 1055 W. 7th Street, Suite 1880, Los Angeles, CA 90017.

5 On the date indicated below, I served the document described as: **FIRST AMENDED**
6 **REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT** on the interested parties in this action by sending []
7 the original [or] [✓] a true copy thereof [✓] to interested parties as follows [or] [] as stated on the
8 attached service list:

9 Brian E. Koegle
10 Michael R. Fostakowsky
11 Caleb A. Miller
12 **POOLE, SHAFFERY & KOEGLE, LLP**
13 25350 Magic Montain Parkway, Second Floor
14 Santa Clarita, California 91355
15 Tel.: 661-290-2991
16 Fax: 661-290-3338
17 bkoegle@pooleshaffery.com
18 mfostakowsky@pooleshaffery.com
19 cmiller@pooleshaffery.com

20 *Attorneys for Defendant Sunvair, Inc.,*

21 [✓] **BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE:** Based on a court order or an agreement
22 of the parties to accept electronic service, I caused the documents to be
23 sent to the persons at the electronic service addresses listed above via
24 third-party cloud service **CASEANYWHERE**.

25 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is
26 true and correct. Executed this **February 7, 2022** at Los Angeles, California.

27 Ivette Hernandez
28 Type or Print Name


Signature