

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Matthew J. Gustin, Esq. (SBN 310714)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
mgustin@lelawfirm.com

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
by Superior Court of CA,
County of Yolo,
on 3/17/2025 11:55 AM
By: J. Duran, Deputy

Attorneys for Plaintiff MICHAEL GIBSON,
on behalf of himself and current and former aggrieved employees

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF YOLO**

MICHAEL GIBSON, on behalf of himself and
current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

ESTES FORWARDING WORLDWIDE LLC;
G. I. TRUCKING COMPANY dba ESTES
WEST; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: CV2025-0792

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF MICHAEL GIBSON'S
COMPLAINT FOR:**

- CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT
TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT OF 2004
("PAGA"), LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

COMES NOW Plaintiff MICHAEL GIBSON ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains
against Defendants ESTES FORWARDING WORLDWIDE LLC; G. I. TRUCKING COMPANY
dba ESTES WEST; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive (collectively "Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*
("PAGA") representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California, himself
and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-exempt
employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated with
Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all hours

1 worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure to pay
2 overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay; failure to authorize or permit all legally required
3 and/or compliant meal periods or pay meal period premium wages; failure to authorize or permit
4 all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or pay rest period premium wages; indemnification
5 for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by employees in direct consequence of discharging
6 their duties; statutory penalties for failure to timely pay earned wages during employment; statutory
7 penalties for failure to provide accurate wage statements; statutory waiting time penalties in the
8 form of continuation wages for failure to timely pay employees all wages due upon separation of
9 employment. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce
10 Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section
11 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

12 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
14 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
15 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
16 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of thirty-five thousand dollars
17 (\$35,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
18 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
19 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
20 California, including but not limited to Yolo County, at 4200 West Capitol Avenue, West
21 Sacramento, CA 95691.

22 **III. PARTIES**

23 1. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
24 Development Agency on behalf of himself and other current and former employees subject to
25 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
26 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work
27 for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
28 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently

1 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by
2 Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Yolo County from in or around
3 September 24, 2023, until on or about October 23, 2024.

4 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant ESTES
5 FORWARDING WORLDWIDE LLC is authorized to do business within the State of California
6 and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-33 are, and at all
7 times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant ESTES FORWARDING
8 WORLDWIDE LLC in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and
9 hour practices or policies. Defendant ESTES FORWARDING WORLDWIDE LLC operates in
10 Yolo County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Yolo County, including but not
11 limited to, at 4200 West Capitol Avenue, West Sacramento, CA 95691.

12 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant G. I.
13 TRUCKING COMPANY dba ESTES WEST is authorized to do business within the State of
14 California and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 34-66 are,
15 and at all times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant G. I. TRUCKING
16 COMPANY dba ESTES WEST in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal
17 wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant G. I. TRUCKING COMPANY dba ESTES WEST
18 operates in Yolo County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Yolo County, including
19 but not limited to, at 4200 West Capitol Avenue, West Sacramento, CA 95691.

20 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 1
21 through 50 are corporations, or are other business entities or organizations of a nature unknown to
22 Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California non-exempt employees, permitted
23 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised control over the wages, hours and working
24 conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

25 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 51
26 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each of the individual defendants is sued
27 individually and in his or her capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner, representative, manager,
28 supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant who violated or caused to be

1 violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor Code and/or any provision of the
2 Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

3 6. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100. Plaintiff
4 sues said defendants by said fictitious names, and will amend this complaint when the true names
5 and capacities are ascertained or when such facts pertaining to liability are ascertained, or as
6 permitted by law or by the Court. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously
7 named defendants is in some manner responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this
8 complaint.

9 7. Plaintiff makes the allegations in this complaint without any admission that, as to
10 any particular allegation, Plaintiff bears the burden of pleading, proving, or persuading and Plaintiff
11 reserves all of Plaintiff's right to plead in the alternative.

12 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**
14 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

15 **(Against all Defendants by Plaintiff on behalf of Themselves, the State of California, and**
16 **Other Current and Former Aggrieved Employees)**

17 8. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

18 9. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges
19 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 510, 512,
20 1194, 1197, 2802, and the applicable Wage Orders.

21 10. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California
22 Labor Code:

23 11. **Failure to pay wages for all hours worked at the legal minimum wage:**
24 Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt
25 employees. In California, an employer is required to pay hourly employees for all "hours worked,"
26 which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the employee
27 is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either directly or
28 indirectly, performing services which inure to the benefit of the employer.

1 12. Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 require an employer to compensate employees
2 for all “hours worked” at least at a minimum wage rate of pay as established by the IWC and the
3 Wage Orders.

4 13. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
5 non-exempt employees worked more minutes per shift than Defendants credited them with having
6 worked. Specifically, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
7 California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages at the applicable minimum wage for all
8 hours worked due to Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited
9 to:

10 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
11 hourly non-exempt employees timely, uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes
12 for every five hours worked due to interrupted meal breaks.

13 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
14 non-exempt employees to line up to wait to undergo and undergo off-the-clock security checks prior
15 to being permitted to clock-in for their start shifts and if Plaintiff and other current and former
16 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees leave the premises for meal and/or rest
17 breaks.

18 14. Therefore, Defendants suffered, permitted, and required Plaintiff and other current
19 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to be subject to Defendants’
20 control without paying wages for that time. This resulted in Plaintiff and other current and former
21 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees working time for which they were not
22 compensated any wages, in violation of Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 and the applicable
23 Wage Order.

24 15. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay**
25 **and/or failure to pay overtime wages at the proper rate of pay:** Defendants employed many of
26 their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt employees. In California, an employer
27 is required to pay hourly employees for all “hours worked,” which includes all time that an employee
28 is under control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered and permitted to work. This

1 includes the time an employee spends, either directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to
2 the benefit of the employer.’

3 16. Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 require an employer to compensate employees a
4 higher rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, in excess of forty (40)
5 hours in a workweek, and on any seventh consecutive day of work in a workweek:

6 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40) hours
7 in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in
8 any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-one-half
9 (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve (12) hours
10 in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay
11 for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a
12 workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an
13 employee.

14 Labor Code section 510.

15 17. In this case, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
16 California-based hourly non-exempt employees overtime wages for all overtime hours worked due
17 to Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to:

18 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
19 hourly non-exempt employees timely, uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes
20 for every five hours worked due to interrupted meal breaks.

21 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
22 non-exempt employees to line up to wait to undergo and undergo off-the-clock security checks prior
23 to being permitted to clock-in for their start shifts and if Plaintiff and other current and former
24 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees leave the premises for meal and/or rest
25 breaks.

26 18. Furthermore, overtime is based upon an employee’s regular rate of pay. “The regular
27 rate at which an employee is employed shall be deemed to include all remuneration for employment
28 paid to, or on behalf, of the employee.” See Division of Labor Standards Enforcement –
Enforcement Policies and Interpretations Manual, Section 49.1.2.

19 19. In this case, Plaintiff alleges that when he and other current and former aggrieved
20 California-based hourly non-exempt employees earned overtime wages, Defendants failed to pay

1 them overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay due to Defendants' failure to include all
2 remuneration when calculating the overtime rate of pay. Specifically, Defendants maintained a
3 policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as "Extra Premium"
4 for example, when calculating Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based
5 hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying overtime.

6 20. The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each
7 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
8 employees were under the control of Defendants but were not compensated. To the extent that the
9 foregoing uncompensated time occurred when Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
10 California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday,
11 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendants failed
12 to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code
13 sections 510, 1194 and 1198, and the applicable Wage Order.

14 21. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
15 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant meal periods and/or failure to**
16 **pay period premium wages:** Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
17 hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked shifts of more than five (5) hours in length and
18 shifts of more than ten (10) hours in length.

19 22. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an
20 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of
21 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the
22 employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 4 at §11;
23 *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ
24 an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee
25 with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh
26 hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period
27 shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. A paid "on duty" meal
28 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved

1 of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

2 23. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
3 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay
4 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
5 sections 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 4 at §11.

6 24. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit legally required and compliant
7 meal periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
8 exempt employees due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures, including but not
9 limited to:

10 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
11 hourly non-exempt employees timely, uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes
12 for every five hours worked due to interrupted meal breaks.

13 (b) Discouraging off-premises meal breaks by requiring Plaintiff and other current and
14 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to be subjected to off-the-clock
15 security checks during meal breaks if they left Defendants' premises during their meal breaks.

16 25. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
17 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
18 hourly non-exempt employees one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday that
19 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees did
20 not receive legally required and compliant meal periods, in violation of Labor Code section 226.7.

21 26. Finally, on occasions when Defendants paid Plaintiff and other current and former
22 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a "premium" wage for late, missed, short,
23 on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted meal periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1) additional
24 hour of pay at Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
25 exempt employees' regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy,
26 practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as "Extra Premium" for
27 example, when calculating Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based
28 hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying meal period premium

1 wages.

2 27. Defendants' foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff and
3 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not receiving
4 wages to compensate them for workdays during which Defendants did not provide them with meal
5 periods in compliance with California law.

6 28. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
7 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant rest periods and/or failure to pay**
8 **rest period premium:** Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
9 non-exempt employees regularly worked shifts of more than three-and-a-half (3.5) hours.

10 29. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
11 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor Code
12 section 226.7; Wage Order 4 at §12. Under California law, "[e]mployees are entitled to 10 minutes'
13 rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six
14 hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on." *Brinker*
15 *Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code section 226.7;
16 Wage Order 4 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each work period.
17 Wage Order 4 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement "obligates employers to permit –
18 and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods." *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*,
19 (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all
20 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

21 30. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer must
22 pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday the
23 employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7; Wage
24 Order 4 at § 12.

25 31. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit all legally required and
26 compliant rest periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
27 non-exempt employees due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not
28 limited to:

1 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
2 hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours worked
3 or major fraction thereof due to requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
4 California-based hourly non-exempt employees to clock out for their rest breaks.

5 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
6 hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours worked
7 or major fraction thereof due to interrupted rest breaks.

8 (c) Discouraging off-premises rest breaks by requiring Plaintiff and other current and
9 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to be subjected to security checks
10 during rest breaks if they left Defendants' premises during their rest breaks that resulted in
11 disciplinary actions taken against them.

12 32. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
13 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
14 hourly non-exempt employees with one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday
15 they did not receive legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor Code section
16 226.7.

17 33. Finally, on occasions when Defendants did pay Plaintiff and other current and former
18 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a "premium" wage for late, missed, short,
19 on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted rest periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1) additional
20 hour of pay at Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
21 exempt employees' regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy,
22 practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such "Extra Premium" for example,
23 when calculating Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
24 exempt employees' regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying rest period premiums.

25 34. Defendants' foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff and
26 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not receiving
27 wages to compensate them for workdays in which Defendants did not provide them with rest periods
28 in compliance with California law.

1 35. **Failure to Indemnify for Losses and Expenditures Incurred as Part of**
2 **Employment:** California law requires that every employer must indemnify its employees for all
3 necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in discharge of his or her duties or at the
4 obedience of the directions of the employer. Moreover, an employer is prohibited from passing the
5 ordinary business expenses and losses of the employer onto the employee. (Lab. Code, § 2802.)

6 36. Defendants have violated Labor Code Section 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiff
7 and other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees' necessary
8 expenditures they incurred in the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendants employed
9 policies, practices, and/or procedures included, but not limited to:

10 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based non-
11 exempt hourly employees to use or purchase their own tools and/or resources in order to work for
12 Defendants, including but not limited to tools for work-related purposes – without reimbursing
13 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees for
14 such use.

15 37. Moreover, Defendants employed policies and procedures which ensured Plaintiff and
16 aggrieved employees would not receive indemnification for their employment related expenses.
17 This practice resulted in Plaintiff and aggrieved employees not receiving such indemnification in
18 compliance with California law.

19 38. Therefore, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for their
20 employment related expenses, including but not limited to costs related to use of their personal cell
21 phones and costs associated with their uniforms pursuant to Labor Code section 2802.

22 39. **Failure to timely pay earned wages during employment:** In California, wages
23 must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the
24 employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code section 204(a). Wages earned
25 between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 16th and
26 the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any
27 calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. *Id.* Other payroll
28 periods such as those that are weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly, must be paid within seven (7)

1 calendar days following the close of the payroll period in which wages were earned. Labor Code
2 section 204(d).

3 40. As a derivative of Plaintiff's claims above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to
4 timely pay Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
5 employees' earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages
6 and/or rest period premium wages), in violation of Labor Code section 204. Defendants'
7 aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in their failure to pay Plaintiff's and
8 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' their earned
9 wages within the applicable time frames outlined in Labor Code section 204.

10 41. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
11 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
12 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
13 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by
14 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful
15 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,
16 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor
17 Code section 1198, the Defendant secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while
18 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

19 42. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section
20 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an employee
21 his or her wages, the employer must "furnish each of his or her employees ... an itemized statement
22 in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any
23 employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
24 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare
25 Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
26 is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all deductions made on written orders
27 of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive
28 dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her

1 social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all
2 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
3 worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

4 43. As a result of Defendants’ knowing and intentional failure to pay Plaintiff and other
5 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages earned
6 (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period
7 premium wages) Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
8 exempt employees’ wage statements were rendered inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section
9 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9). As such Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
10 non-exempt employees were unable to promptly and easily determine the accurate information
11 required by Labor Code section 226(a).

12 44. **Failure to pay employees all wages due at time of termination/resignation:** An
13 employer is required to pay all unpaid wages timely after an employee’s employment ends. The
14 wages are due immediately upon termination (Labor Code section 201) or within seventy-two (72)
15 hours of resignation (Labor Code section 202).

16 45. As a result of the aforementioned willful violations of the Labor Code, because
17 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
18 non-exempt employees all their earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal
19 period premium wages, and/or rest period premium wages), Defendants failed to pay those
20 employees timely after each employee’s termination and/or resignation, in violation of Labor Code
21 sections 201, 202, and 203.

22 46. Labor Code sections 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee,
23 on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees, to bring a civil action to
24 recover civil penalties against all Defendants pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code
25 section 2699.3.

26 47. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
27 section 2699.3. On January 8, 2025, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and
28 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of

1 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
2 violations alleged.

3 48. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by
4 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code
5 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the
6 parties notice within 60 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends
7 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

8 49. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
9 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7,
10 510, 512, and 1194. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, preceding
11 Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the following
12 amounts:

13 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, and 2802;
14 one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and
15 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent
16 violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

17 b. For violations of Labor Code section 226(a), alternatively, two hundred fifty
18 dollars (\$250) for each employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each
19 subsequent violation, one thousand dollars (\$1000) for each underpaid employee for each pay period
20 [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 226.3].

21 c. For violations of Labor Code section 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50) for each
22 employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, one
23 hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts
24 established by Labor Code section 558].

25 d. For violations of Labor Code section 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for
26 each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, or any
27 willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee,
28 plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code

1 section 210].

2 e. For violations of Labor Code section 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for
3 each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, or any
4 willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee,
5 plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code
6 section 225.5].

7 50. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g), Plaintiff is entitled to an award of
8 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with his claims for civil penalties.

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 **WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND ON OTHER AGGRIEVED**
11 **EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:**

12 **ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:**

13 1. That Defendants be found to have violated the provisions of the Labor Code and the
14 IWC Wages Orders as to the Plaintiff and aggrieved employees;

15 2. For any and all legally applicable penalties during the relevant statute of limitations
16 subject to any permissible tolling, including but not limited to those recoverable under the California
17 Labor Code, including but not limited to sections 210, 225.5, 226.3, 558, 2699(f);

18 3. For attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including but not limited to those recoverable
19 under California Labor Code section 2699(g); and

20 4. For such and other further relief, in law and/or equity, as the Court deems just or
21 appropriate.

22 Dated: March 17, 2025

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

23
24 By: /s/ Matthew J. Gustin
Joseph Lavi, Esq.
25 Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Matthew J. Gustin, Esq.
26 Attorneys for Plaintiff
MICHAEL GIBSON, on behalf of himself and
27 current and former aggrieved employees
28