

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
 Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
 Pooja V. Patel, Esq. (SBN 317891)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
 8889 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 200
 Beverly Hills, California 90211
 Telephone: (310) 432-0000
 Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
 Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
 vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
 ppatel@lelawfirm.com
 wht1@lelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff CARLOS Y. VILLALOBOS,
 on behalf of himself and current and former aggrieved employees

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES-CENTRAL DISTRICT**

CARLOS Y. VILLALOBOS, on behalf of
 himself and other aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MAERSK, INC.; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,
 Defendants.

Case No.: **22STCV33047**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF CARLOS Y.
 VILLALOBOS' COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff CARLOS Y. VILLALOBOS ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and
 complains against Defendants MAERSK, INC.; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive (collectively,
 "Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Private Attorneys' General Act of 2004, Lab. 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 worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure

1 to authorize or permit all legally required and compliant meal periods or pay meal period
2 premium wages; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and compliant rest periods or
3 pay rest period premium wages; statutory penalties for failure to timely pay earned wages during
4 employment; statutory penalties for failure to provide accurate wage statements; statutory waiting
5 time penalties in the form of continuation wages for failure to timely pay employees all wages due
6 upon separation of employment. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the
7 Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to
8 Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California,
9 and others aggrieved.

10 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

11 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
12 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
13 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
14 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars
15 (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
16 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
17 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
18 California, including but not limited to Los Angeles County, at 12811 Excelsior Drive., Santa Fe
19 Springs, CA 90670.

20 3. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Judicial Council of California enacted
21 Emergency Rule 9 to the California Rules of Court, which provided that, notwithstanding any
22 other law, the statutes of limitations and repose for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are
23 tolled from April 6, 2020, until October 1, 2020.

24 **III. PARTIES**

25 4. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
26 Development Agency on behalf of himself and other current and former employees subject to
27 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
28 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will

1 work for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
2 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the
3 currently named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was
4 employed by Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Los Angeles from
5 approximately from in or around May 11, 2020, until on or about May 9, 2022.

6 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant MAERSK,
7 INC. is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business in the State
8 of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant hereto were persons
9 acting on behalf of Defendant MAERSK, INC. in the establishment of, or ratification of, the
10 aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant MAERSK, INC., operates
11 in Los Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and putative class members in Los Angeles
12 County, including but not limited to, at 12811 Excelsior Drive., Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670.

13 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 1
14 through 50 are corporations, or are other business entities or organizations of a nature unknown to
15 Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California non-exempt employees, permitted
16 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised control over the wages, hours and
17 working conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

18 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 51
19 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each of the individual defendants is sued
20 individually and in his or her capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner, representative, manager,
21 supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant who violated or caused to
22 be violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor Code and/or any provision of
23 the Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

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

1 complaint.

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

5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **CIVIL PENALTIES AND WAGES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS**

7 **GENERAL ACT OF 2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

8 **(Against all Defendants by Plaintiff)**

9 10. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

10 11. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding Plaintiff sending the initial
11 PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201,
12 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, and/or Sections 14 and 15 of the applicable
13 Wage Orders.

14 12. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California
15 Labor Code:

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

22 14. Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 require an employer to compensate employees
23 for all "hours worked" at least at a minimum wage rate of pay as established by the IWC and the
24 Wage Orders.

25 15. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
26 hourly non-exempt employees worked more minutes per shift than Defendants credited them with
27 having worked. Specifically, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former
28 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages at the applicable minimum

1 wage for all hours worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but
2 not limited to: Defendants required Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
3 based hourly non-exempt employees to go through security screening at the beginning of their
4 shift, any time they left the premises during meal or rest breaks or returned from leaving the
5 premises during meal or rest breaks, and at the end of their shift. This time spent going through the
6 security check included time that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
7 hourly non-exempt employees had to wait while other employees were also lined up to go through
8 security screening and walking from the security screening location to the time clock or walking
9 from the time clock to the security screening location. Even though the security screening was a
10 requirement by Defendants, Defendants did not pay wages to Plaintiff and other current and
11 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees for the time they waited in line
12 or went through security screening at the beginning of their shift, any time they left the premises
13 during meal breaks or returned from leaving the premises during meal breaks, at the end of their
14 shift, or time spent walking from the security screening location to the time clock or walking from
15 the time clock to the security screening location. The security screening occurred outside of the
16 Plaintiff and other warehouse employees' recorded work time (i.e., outside of the time employees
17 were "clocked in") and Defendants did not pay any additional wages to Plaintiff or other
18 warehouse employees for this time.

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

25 17. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay:**
26 Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt
27 employees. In California, an employer is required to pay hourly employees for all "hours worked,"
28 which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the

1 employee is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either
2 directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to the benefit of the employer.'

3 18. 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
5 (40) 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)
7 hours in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of
8 work in any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-
9 one-half (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve
10 (12) hours in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular
11 rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any
12 seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the
13 regular rate of pay of an employee.

14 Labor Code section 510.

15 19. In this case, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former
16 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees overtime wages for all overtime hours
17 worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to:
18 Defendants required Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
19 exempt employees to go through security screening at the beginning of their shift, any time they
20 left the premises during meal or rest breaks or returned from leaving the premises during meal or
21 rest breaks, and at the end of their shift. This time spent going through the security check included
22 time that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
23 employees had to wait while other employees were also lined up to go through security screening
24 and walking from the security screening location to the time clock or walking from the time clock
25 to the security screening location. Even though the security screening was a requirement by
26 Defendants, Defendants did not pay wages to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
27 California-based hourly non-exempt employees for the time they waited in line or went through
28 security screening at the beginning of their shift, any time they left the premises during meal
breaks or returned from leaving the premises during meal breaks, at the end of their shift, or time
spent walking from the security screening location to the time clock or walking from the time
clock to the security screening location. The security screening occurred outside of the Plaintiff

1 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees recorded
2 work time (i.e., outside of the time employees were “clocked in”) and Defendants did not pay any
3 additional wages to Plaintiff or other warehouse employees for this time. In addition, at times
4 Plaintiff and other warehouse employees worked “overtime” consisting of hours worked in excess
5 of 8 up to 12 hours in a workday, over 40 hours in a workweek, up to 8 hours on any seventh
6 consecutive day in a workweek, hours worked in excess of 12 hours in a workday, or over 8 hours
7 on any seventh consecutive day in a workweek. To the extent the time spent waiting in line or
8 passing through security checks was during these overtime hours, Defendants did not pay
9 additional wages at an overtime rate (i.e., 1.5 times the employees’ regular rate of pay for hours in
10 excess of 8 up to 12 hours in a workday, over 40 hours in a workweek, up to 8 hours on any
11 seventh consecutive day in a workweek and 2 times the employees’ regular rate of pay for hours in
12 excess of 12 hours in a workday or over 8 hours on any seventh consecutive day in a workweek)
13 to the employees

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

22 21. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
23 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant meal periods:** Plaintiff and other
24 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked
25 shifts of more than five (5) hours in length and shifts of more than ten (10) hours in length.

26 22. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an
27 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of
28 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee’s activities prior to the

1 employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512; Wage Order 9 at §11; *Brinker*
2 *Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ an
3 employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee
4 with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh
5 hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period
6 shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. A paid "on duty" meal
7 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being
8 relieved of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

9 23. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
10 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay
11 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
12 section 226.7; Wage Order 9 at §11.

13 24. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit legally required and compliant
14 meal periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
15 exempt employees due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures, including but not
16 limited to: failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
17 hourly non-exempt employees with all meal periods as required by and in compliance with the
18 law, including full duty free and timely meal periods. Plaintiff and other current and former
19 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees were required to only take a thirty-
20 minute meal break but were also required to pass through security checks and/or wait in line for
21 employees passing through security checks and walking between time clocks and security
22 locations during their meal period time if leaving/entering the premises during meal periods
23 resulting in Defendants providing less than a 30-minute meal break, a meal break that was on-
24 duty, and/or discouraging employees from taking an off-duty meal break.

25 25. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
26 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
27 based hourly non-exempt employees one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each
28 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt

1 employees did not receive legally required and compliant meal periods, in violation of Labor Code
2 section 226.7.

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

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

11 28. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
12 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor
13 Code section 226.7; Wage Order 9 at §12. Under California law, "[e]mployees are entitled to 10
14 minutes' rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more
15 than six hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so
16 on." *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code
17 section 226.7; Wage Order 9 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of
18 each work period. Wage Order 9 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement "obligates
19 employers to permit – and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods." *Augustus v. ABM*
20 *Security Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must
21 relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

22 29. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer
23 must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday
24 the employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7;
25 Wage Order 9 at § 12.

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

1 limited to: Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
2 employees with uninterrupted duty free 10-minute rest periods for each four hours or major
3 fraction thereof worked. As noted above, Defendants required Plaintiff and other current and
4 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to go through security screening
5 at the beginning of their shift, any time they left the premises during meal or rest breaks or
6 returned from leaving the premises during meal or rest breaks, and at the end of their shift. This
7 time spent passing through security checks and/or waiting in line for employees passing through
8 security checks was uncompensated time which caused portions of Plaintiff and other current and
9 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees rest period to be not relieved of
10 all duties and employer control and/or less than a 10-minute rest breaks being given for each 4
11 hours or major fraction thereof worked. Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
12 California-based hourly non-exempt employees were required to only take a ten minute break but
13 were also required to pass through security checks and/or wait in line for employees passing
14 through security checks during their rest period time if leaving/entering when leaving the premises
15 for a rest period resulting in less than a 10 minute rest break being provided, limiting an
16 employees' ability to take a full 10 minute rest period off-premises, and/or discouraging
17 employees from taking a rest period off-premises.

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

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

27 33. **Failure to timely pay earned wages during employment:** In California, wages
28 must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the

1 employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code section 204(a). Wages
2 earned between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the
3 16th and the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day,
4 inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following
5 month. *Id.* Other payroll periods such as those that are weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly, must be
6 paid within seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period in which wages were
7 earned. Labor Code section 204(d).

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

15 35. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section
16 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an
17 employee his or her wages, the employer must "furnish each of his or her employees ... an
18 itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the
19 employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is
20 exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of
21 the Industrial Welfare Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable
22 piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all
23 deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5)
24 net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the
25 name of the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal
26 entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
27 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee."

28 36. As a derivative of Plaintiff's allegations above, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff

1 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
2 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest
3 period premium wages) rendered Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-
4 based hourly non-exempt employees' wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code
5 section 226.

6 **37. Failure to pay employees all wages due at time of termination/resignation:** An
7 employer is required to pay all unpaid wages timely after an employee's employment ends. The
8 wages are due immediately upon termination (Labor Code section 201) or within seventy-two (72)
9 hours of resignation (Labor Code section 202).

10 **38.** As a derivative of Plaintiff's allegations above, because Defendants failed to pay
11 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
12 all their earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages,
13 and/or rest period premium wages), Defendants failed to pay those employees timely after each
14 employee's termination and/or resignation, in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

15 **39.** Defendants' violations of Wage Order 9 constituted violations of Labor Code
16 section 1198, which prohibits employment under conditions of labor that violate the Wage Orders.

17 **40.** Labor Code sections 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved
18 employee, on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees, to bring a civil
19 action to recover civil penalties against all Defendants pursuant to the procedures specified in
20 Labor Code section 2699.3.

21 **41.** Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor
22 Code section 2699.3. On June 30, 2022, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and
23 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of
24 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
25 violations alleged.

26 **42.** Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by
27 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code
28 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the

1 parties notice within 60 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends
2 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

3 43. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
4 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204 226, 226.7, 510,
5 512, 1194, 1197, 1198, beginning one (1) year preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim
6 Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the following amounts:

7 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226.7, 2802, 512,
8 and 1198; one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial
9 violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each
10 subsequent violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

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

15 c. For violations of Labor Code section 510, fifty dollars (\$50) for each
16 employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, one
17 hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts
18 established by Labor Code section 558] and any unpaid wages.

19 d. For violations of Labor Code section 1194 and 1197, one hundred dollars
20 (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each
21 subsequent violation, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay
22 period [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 1197.1] and any unpaid wages.

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

25 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

26 **WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF, THE STATE OF**
27 **CALIFONRIA, AND ON OTHER AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:**

28 ///

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

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

4 2. For any and all legally applicable penalties during the relevant statute of limitations
5 subject to any permissible tolling, including but not limited to those recoverable under the
6 California Labor Code, including but not limited to section 2699(f);

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

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

11
12 Dated: October _7, 2022

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

13
14 By:



15 Joseph Lavi, Esq.
16 Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
17 Pooja V. Patel, Esq.
18 Attorneys for Plaintiff
19 CARLOS Y. VILLALOBOS
20 on behalf of himself and current and former
21 aggrieved employees
22
23
24
25
26
27
28