

Assigned for all purposes to: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Officer: Douglas Stern

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Melissa A. Huether, Esq. (SBN 316604)
Christine Gutierrez, Esq. (SBN 344128)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Emails: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
mhuether@lelawfirm.com
cgutierrez@lelawfirm.com
WHT3@lelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff ZIA AHMED,
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**

ZIA AHMED, on behalf of himself and other
aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

O HOTEL MANAGEMENT, INC.; and DOES 1
to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 22STCV37064

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF ZIA AHMED'S
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff ZIA AHMED ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains against
Defendants O HOTEL MANAGEMENT, 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-

1 exempt employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated
2 with Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all
3 hours worked at the employees' minimum wage rate and overtime rate, to provide all legally
4 required and legally compliant meal and rest periods, failure to timely pay earned wages during
5 employment, failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements, and failure to timely pay
6 all unpaid wages following separation of employment. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis,
7 following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable
8 attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff,
9 the State of California, and others aggrieved.

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

14 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15 3. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
16 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
17 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
18 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars
19 (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
20 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
21 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
22 California, including but not limited to Los Angeles County, at 819 Flower Street, California
23 90017.

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 March 2020 until on or about February 11, 2022.

6 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant O HOTEL
7 MANAGEMENT, INC. is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing
8 business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant
9 hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant O HOTEL MANAGEMENT, INC. in the
10 establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies.
11 Defendant O HOTEL MANAGEMENT, INC. operates in Los
12 Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County,
13 including but not limited to, at 819 Flower Street, Los Angeles, California 90017.

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

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

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

1 named defendants is in some manner responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this
2 complaint.

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

6 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

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

11 11. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding Plaintiff sending the initial
12 PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201,
13 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1198, 2802, and Sections 14 and 15 of the
14 applicable Wage Orders.

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

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

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

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

aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages at the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to: "rounding down" or "shaving down" Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California based hourly non-exempt employees' punches to the nearest quarter of an hour to the benefit of Defendants without paying Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California based hourly non-exempt employees for this time.

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

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

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

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

Labor Code section 510.

19. In this case, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former

1 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees overtime wages for all overtime hours
2 worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to:
3 "rounding down" or "shaving down" Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California
4 based hourly non-exempt employees' punches to the nearest quarter of an hour to the benefit of
5 Defendants without paying Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California based
6 hourly non-exempt employees for this time.

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

15 21. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
16 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant meal periods:** Plaintiff and other
17 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked
18 shifts of more than five (5) hours in length and 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; Wage Order 5 at §11; *Brinker*
23 *Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ an
24 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

1 relieved 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 section 226.7; Wage Order 5 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: (1) failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
10 hourly non-exempt employees uninterrupted duty-free meal periods of no less than thirty (30)
11 minutes for each five-hour period of work as required by law; (2) "rounding" down or "shaving"
12 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
13 clock-in and clock-out for their meal periods to the nearest quarter of an hour resulting in meal
14 periods less than 30 minutes; and (3) failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former
15 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a second uninterrupted duty-free meal
16 period of no less than thirty (30) minutes for each workday that Plaintiff and the Meal Period
17 Class work shifts over ten (10) hours.

18 25. 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 one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each
21 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
22 employees did not receive legally required and compliant meal periods, in violation of Labor Code
23 section 226.7.

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

28 ///

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

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

16 29. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer
17 must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday
18 the employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7;
19 Wage Order 5 at § 12.

20 30. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit all legally required and
21 compliant rest periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
22 non-exempt employees due to Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not
23 limited to: failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
24 hourly non-exempt employees uninterrupted duty-free rest periods of no less than ten (10) minutes
25 for each four (4)-hour period or major fraction thereof.

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

1 workday they did not receive legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor
2 Code section 226.7.

3 32. 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 in which Defendants did not provide them with
6 rest periods in compliance with California law.

7 33. **Failure to timely pay earned wages during employment:** In California, wages
8 must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the
9 employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code section 204(a). Wages
10 earned between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the
11 16th and the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day,
12 inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following
13 month. *Id.* Other payroll periods such as those that are weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly, must be
14 paid within seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period in which wages were
15 earned. Labor Code section 204(d).

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

23 35. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section
24 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an
25 employee his or her wages, the employer must "furnish each of his or her employees ... an
26 itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the
27 employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is
28 exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of

1 the Industrial Welfare Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable
2 piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all
3 deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5)
4 net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the
5 name of the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal
6 entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
7 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

8 36. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff
9 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
10 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest
11 period premium wages) rendered Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-
12 based hourly non-exempt employees’ wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code
13 section 226.

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

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

23 39. Defendants’ violations of Wage Order 5 constituted violations of Labor Code
24 section 1198, which prohibits employment under conditions of labor that violate the Wage Orders.

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

1 41. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor
2 Code section 2699.3. On June 17, 2022, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and
3 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of
4 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
5 violations alleged.

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

11 43. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
12 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204 226, 226.7, 510,
13 512, 1194, 1197, and 1198 beginning one (1) year preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA
14 Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the following amounts:

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

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

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

27 d. For violations of Labor Code section 1194 and 1197, one hundred dollars
28 (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each

subsequent violation, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 1197.1] and any unpaid wages.

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

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

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

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

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

Dated: November 23, 2022

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

By: 

Joseph Lavi, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Melissa A. Huether, Esq.
Christine Gutierrez, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
ZIA AHMED
on behalf of himself and current and former
aggrieved employees