

Nicol E. Hajjar, Esq. (SBN 303102)
nicol.hajjar@wilshirelawfirm.com
Rachel J. Vinson, Esq. (SBN 331434)
rachel.vinson@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90010
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of Solano
05/22/2025 at 03:09:39 PM
By: S. Brack, Deputy Clerk

\$435

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SOLANO

GABRIEL AFFONSO, JR. and CYNTHIA
CABRERA-PESKIN, on behalf of the State of
California and other aggrieved persons,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Z GOLF FOOD & BEVERAGE SERVICES
DBA WEDGEWOOD WEDDINGS, a limited
liability company; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: CU25-04751

**PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

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

1 Plaintiffs GABRIEL AFFONSO, JR. and CYNTHIA CABRERA-PESKIN (“Plaintiffs”),
2 based upon facts that either have evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary support after
3 a reasonable opportunity for further investigation and discovery, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiffs brings this action against Defendant Z GOLF FOOD & BEVERAGE
6 SERVICES DBA WEDGEWOOD WEDDINGS and DOES 1 through 10 (Z GOLF FOOD &
7 BEVERAGE SERVICES DBA WEDGEWOOD WEDDINGS and DOES 1 through 10 are
8 collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General
9 Act of 2004, California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) stemming from Defendants’ failure
10 to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failure to provide
11 legally compliant meal periods and related meal period premiums, failure to authorize and permit
12 rest periods and related rest period premiums, failure to pay all earned wages twice per month,
13 failure to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failure to furnish accurate
14 wage statements, and failure to indemnify for necessary business expenditures.

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

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

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

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

6. 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.

7. 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 employers of Plaintiffs 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. Plaintiffs

8. Plaintiffs GABRIEL AFFONSO, JR. and CYNTHIA CABRERA-PESKIN are residents of California who have worked for Defendants in California as hourly-paid, non-exempt employees since approximately May 2023 and April 2023, respectively.

1 **B. Defendants**

2 9. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based upon that information and belief
3 allege, that Defendant Z GOLF FOOD & BEVERAGE SERVICES DBA WEDGEWOOD
4 WEDDINGS is and at all times herein mentioned, was:

5 (a) An entity qualified to do business and actually conducting business in
6 numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Solano
7 County; and,

8 (b) The former employer of Plaintiffs and the current and/or former employer
9 of the Aggrieved Employees because Defendant Z GOLF FOOD &
10 BEVERAGE SERVICES DBA WEDGEWOOD WEDDINGS suffered and
11 permitted Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled
12 their wages, hours, or working conditions.

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

19 11. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and
20 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or
21 injured a significant number of the Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees in the State of
22 California.

23 12. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at all relevant times each
24 Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiffs and the
25 other employees and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiffs
26 are informed and believe and thereon allege that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the
27 principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary,
28 affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of

1 the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise
2 for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable
3 for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and
4 thereon allege that each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships
5 alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have known about, and authorized, ratified,
6 adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

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

8 13. Plaintiffs worked for Defendants in California as hourly-paid, non-exempt
9 employee since approximately May 2023 and April 2023, respectively. During Plaintiffs’
10 employment for Defendants, Defendants paid Plaintiffs an hourly wage and classified them as non-
11 exempt from overtime. Defendants typically scheduled Plaintiffs to work at least five days in a
12 workweek and at least eight hours per day, but Plaintiffs regularly worked more than eight hours
13 in a workday and more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

14 14. Throughout Plaintiffs’ employment, Defendants committed numerous labor code
15 violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiffs’ experience working for Defendants was
16 typical and illustrative.

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

19 15. Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee.
20 “Hours worked” is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer,
21 and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to
22 do so.

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

26 17. Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not
27 be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation
28 beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states

1 that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the IWC is unlawful.

2 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not
3 paying Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum, straight
4 time, and overtime wages. Defendants required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work
5 “off-the-clock,” uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved
6 Employees to perform work before and after shifts, and during their meal periods. Some of this
7 unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked,
8 Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved
9 Employees worked.

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

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

17 20. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiffs
18 and the Aggrieved Employees with their legally mandated 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free
19 meal periods. Defendants regularly, but not always, required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved
20 Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute,
21 uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating
22 Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the
23 fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Instead, Defendants continued to assert control over
24 Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform
25 work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory meal
26 periods, or by denying Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a meal period.
27 Defendants also never informed Plaintiffs of their right to, nor permitted him to take, a second
28 meal period when Plaintiffs worked at least ten hours of work in a workday. Accordingly,

Defendants' policy and practice was not to provide meal periods to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

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

C. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

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

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

24. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Defendants, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not

1 authorized and permitted to take.

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

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

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

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

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

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

24 29. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records required by the California
25 Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees
26 the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the
27 accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendants' records. Therefore, Plaintiffs and the
28 Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which

1 resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiffs and the
2 Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use
3 and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in
4 seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective
5 damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendants' knowing failure to
6 comply with the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiffs and the
7 Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing,
8 understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

9 **F. Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

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

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

28 32. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiffs and the

1 Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates,
2 and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages for meal periods
3 that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for rest periods that
4 were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law).

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

10 **G. Failure to Indemnify for Necessary Expenditures**

11 34. Labor Code § 2802(a) provides that employers shall indemnify his or her employees
12 for all necessary business expenditures or losses that have been incurred by the employees in direct
13 discharge of his or her duties. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause
14 of action, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses
15 that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved
16 Employees regularly paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses, including,
17 without limitation, costs related to gas mileage. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees incurred
18 substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendants, but Defendants
19 failed to indemnify Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related
20 expenses.

21 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of**
23 **2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698, et seq.)**

24 35. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege all preceding paragraphs as though
25 fully set forth herein.

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

28 37. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action

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

7 38. Plaintiffs have exhausted their administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor
8 Code § 2699.3. On January 28, 2025, Plaintiffs gave written notice by online filing to the Labor
9 and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to Defendants of the
10 specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiffs and current
11 and former Aggrieved Employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations.
12 Plaintiffs also paid the filing fee. Plaintiffs’ PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-1076353-25.

13 39. The statute of limitations is tolled while a Plaintiffs exhausts his or her
14 administrative remedies with California’s LWDA prior to suit, which is required by the statute.
15 (*See* Labor Code § 2699.3(d).)

16 40. More than sixty-five (65) days has elapsed since Plaintiffs provided notice, but the
17 LWDA has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’ Labor Code violations discussed
18 in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiffs may commence a civil action to recover penalties under
19 Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code described in this
20 Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under California Labor Code
21 §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

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

26 42. In addition, Plaintiffs seeks an award of reasonable attorney’s fees and costs
27 pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, “Any employee who prevails in any action
28 shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney’s fees and costs.”

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 Plaintiffs, on behalf of all similarly aggrieved employees, pray for relief and judgment
3 against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

4 1. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California
5 Labor Code by failing to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages),
6 failing to provide meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, failing to pay all earned
7 wages twice per month, failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods,
8 failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to indemnify for necessary business
9 expenditures.

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

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

13 4. Attorneys' fees and costs reasonably incurred;

14 5. Injunctive and declaratory relief to the extent allowed by PAGA; and,

15 6. Such other and further relief that the Court deems proper.
16

17 Respectfully submitted,

18 Dated: May 22, 2025

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

19 By: 

20 Nicol E. Hajjar, Esq.

21 Rachel J. Vinson, Esq.

22 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*
23
24
25
26
27
28