

Drew Lewis, Esq. (SBN 309288)
Jessica Hart, Esq. (SBN 331441)
DREW LEWIS, PC
2999 Douglas Blvd. Ste. 180
Roseville, CA 95661
Tel: (833) 600-7400
Email: drew@drewlewis.law
jhart@drewlewis.law

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

MICHELLE ARMSTRONG on behalf of
similarly situated employees,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

WURM'S JANITORIAL SERVICES,
INC., a California Corporation, FELIPE
ALDEA, an individual, DOES 1-50,
inclusive,

Defendant(s).

Case No.: CVRI2202458

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

**PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**

1. **Failure to pay Minimum Wage (Lab. Code, §§ 1194, 1194.2, Wage Order 5)**
2. **Failure to pay Overtime (Lab. Code, §§ 510, 1194; Wage Order 5)**
3. **Inaccurate Wage Statement Penalties (Lab. Code, § 226)**
4. **Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment (Lab. Code, §§ 204, 210)**
5. **Unlawful Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17200)**
6. **Failure to Provide Rest Breaks (Lab. Code, §§ 226.7)**
7. **Failure to Provide Meal Breaks (Lab. Code, §§ 226.7, 512)**
8. **Failure to Pay Reimbursements (Lab. Code, § 2802)**
9. **Private Attorneys General Act (Lab. Code § 2698, *et seq.*)**

COMES NOW, Plaintiff MICHELLE ARMSTRONG (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself and similarly situated employees hereby file this Complaint against WURM’S JANITORIAL SERVICES, INC, a California Corporation, FELIPE ALDEA, an individual, DOES 1-50, inclusive (“Defendants”). On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees bring this class and Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) case based on alleged violations of the California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 5-100 against Defendants. As set forth in more detail below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants are liable to her and other similarly situated current and former employees, who worked in California as non-exempt employees, from June 16, 2018 to the present for damages, penalties, and related relief. These claims are based on Defendants: 1) failure to pay for all hours worked, including drive time; 2) failure to provide and maintain accurate and compliant wage statements; 3) failure to provide meal and rest breaks or pay premiums in lieu thereof; 4) failure to pay reimbursements for work-related expenses; and 5) failure to timely pay wages.

VENUE & JURISDICTION

2. This case is subject to the jurisdiction of this Court pursuant to the California Labor Code, California Business and Professions Code, and the California Code of Civil Procedure. The amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional minimum of this Court. At all times alleged herein, one or more Defendants were residents of or were doing business in, the State of California, County of Riverside.

3. Venue in Riverside County is proper pursuant to sections 395 and 395.5 of the Code of Civil Procedure in that at all relevant times herein, at least some of the violations of law alleged to have been committed herein occurred in Riverside County and/or because each Defendant is found, maintains offices, or conducts substantial business in the County of Riverside.

4. As a result of the violations alleged herein, all Defendants are subject to PAGA penalties, which Plaintiff seeks for herself for other aggrieved current and former employees of

1 Defendants, and the State of California. Plaintiff is an aggrieved employee within the meaning
2 of Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* and has complied with the pre-filing requirements of the
3 PAGA. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3 (a), Plaintiff gave written notice of the facts and
4 legal basis for her claims, as alleged herein, via online submission on June 7, 2022 to the
5 California Labor & Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and sent notice via certified
6 mail to Defendants the same day. To date, the LWDA has not provided a response to Plaintiff’s
7 notice. As such, Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies and may bring an action on
8 behalf of herself and all other similarly situated employees (*i.e.* Aggrieved Employees).
9 Similarly situated employees includes but are not limited to: all non-exempt employees who
10 have or continue to work for Defendants in California from June 7, 2021 to the present.

11 PARTIES

12 5. Plaintiff MICHELLE ARMSTRONG is an individual over the age of 18 and a
13 resident of the State of California. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Plaintiff was
14 employed by Defendants as a janitor.

15 6. On Plaintiff’s information and belief, Defendant WURM’S JANITORIAL
16 SERVICES, INC. is a California Corporation organized and existing under the laws of
17 California.

18 7. On Plaintiff’s information and belief, Defendant FELIPE ALDEA is an
19 individual and during all times relevant to this Complaint is and was the Chief Financial Officer
20 for Defendant WURM’S JANITORIAL SERVICES, INC and, as such, Defendant FELIPE
21 ALDEA is believed to be an “other person acting on behalf of an employer” within the meaning
22 of Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1.

23 8. Plaintiff does not know the true names and capacities of Defendants sued in this
24 Complaint as DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and therefore sues these Defendants by fictitious
25 names. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of DOES 1
26 through 20, inclusive when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereupon alleges
27 that each of the Defendants named herein as DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, is responsive in
28 some manner for the occurrence, injury, and other damages alleged in this Complaint.

9. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereupon alleges, that each Defendant was in some manner responsible for the acts and damages alleged herein, and/or are indebted to Plaintiff as alleged herein, and that each Defendant was the agent, employer, and co-conspirator of each other Defendant, and was acting in the course and scope of such agency and conspiracy. In this Complaint where Plaintiff refers to Defendant singularly, such reference shall be construed to be a reference to all Defendants named herein, including those named fictitiously.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

10. Plaintiff brings the First through Eighth Causes of Action on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated employees as a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The class Plaintiff seeks to represent is composed of, and defined as follows:

Plaintiff and all non-exempt employees who have or continue to work for Defendants in California from June 16, 2018 to the present.

11. Plaintiff reserves the right under Rule 3.765, California Rules of Court, to amend or modify the class description with greater specificity to further divide into subclasses or to limit to particular issues.

12. This action has been brought and is properly maintained in a class action, pursuant to the provision of the California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 because there is a well-defined community of interests in the litigation and the proposed class is easily ascertainable.

A. Numerosity

13. The putative class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all members is impracticable under the circumstances of this case. While the exact number of class members is unknown to Plaintiff, she is informed and believes that Defendants have employed as many as 100 individuals failing within the above-stated class definition through the State of California during the applicable statute of limitations, who were subjected to the policies and practices outlined in this complaint. As such, the joinder of all members of the putative class is not

1 practicable.

2 14. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' employment
3 records would provide information as to the number and location of all class members.

4 **B. Commonality**

5 15. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the putative class
6 and predominate over questions that affect only individual members of the class. These
7 common questions of law and fact include, without limitation, the following:

- 8 1. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and wage orders by
9 failing to compensate Plaintiff and putative class members for all hours
10 worked, including drive time to work locations;
- 11 2. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and wage orders,
12 by failing to pay all overtime wages due;
- 13 3. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and wage orders by
14 failing to pay all minimum wages due;
- 15 4. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and wage orders by
16 failing to maintain and provide Plaintiff and putative class members
17 accurate records of Plaintiff and putative class members earned wages and
18 hours worked;
- 19 5. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and wage orders by
20 failing to provide Plaintiff and putative class members all meals and rest
21 periods due;
- 22 6. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and wage orders
23 by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and putative class members for business
24 related expenses, including mileage and worked-related cell phone use;
- 25 7. Whether Defendants had a policy and/or practice of failing to pay Plaintiff
26 and members of the putative class minimum wages for all hours worked;
- 27 8. Whether Defendants had a policy and/or practice of failing to pay Plaintiff
28 and members of the putative class all overtime wages due for hours worked

over eight (8) hours per day and forty (40) hours per week;

9. Whether Defendants had a policy and/or practice of failing to allow for, and provide, Plaintiff and members of the putative class meal periods, as required by law;
10. Whether Defendants had a policy and/or practice of failing to allow for, and provide, Plaintiff and members of the putative class rest periods, as required by law;
11. Whether Defendants had a policy and/or practice of failing to provide reimbursement for business expenses to Plaintiff and members of the putative class;
12. Whether as a result of Defendants' policies and practices, Plaintiff and the putative class members received all minimum and overtime wages due and all meal and rest period penalties owed; and
13. Whether as a result of Defendants' policies and practices, Plaintiff and putative class members timely received all wages due and owing during their employment.

C. Typicality

16. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the putative class. The putative class also sustained damages arising out of Defendants' common course of conduct in violation of the law as complained of herein. Plaintiff and all members of the putative class were non-exempt employees who were not paid minimum wages for all hours worked, including drive time, were not provided meal and rest periods as required by law, and were not paid reimbursements for mileage and work-related cell phone use. Additionally, Defendants issued Plaintiff and all members of the putative class wage statements that did not comply with Labor Code section 226. As a result, Plaintiff and each member of the putative class have suffered the same type of harm and seek the same type of recovery based on the same legal theories.

D. Adequacy

17. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interest of the members of the

1 putative class. Plaintiff resided and worked for Defendants in California during all relevant
2 times. Moreover, Plaintiff will adequately represent the putative class as she has no interests
3 that are adverse to those of the putative class members. Additionally, Plaintiff has retained
4 counsel who has substantial experience in wage and hour matters.

5 **E. Superiority**

6 18. A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient
7 adjudication of the controversy since the individual joinder of all members of the putative calls
8 is impracticable. Class action treatment will permit a larger number of similarly situated persons
9 to prosecute their common claims in a single forum simultaneously, efficiently, and without the
10 unnecessary duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would have.
11 Damages suffered by each individual member of the class being relatively small the expense and
12 burden of the individual litigation would make it difficult or impossible for individual members
13 of the class to redress the wrongs done to them, and an important public interest will be severed
14 by addressing the matter as a class action. The cost to the court system of adjudication of such
15 individual litigation would be substantial. Individual litigation would also present the potential
16 for inconsistent or contradictory judgments.

17 19. Plaintiff is unaware of any difficulties that are likely to be encountered in the
18 management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action.

19 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

20 20. Plaintiff began working for Defendants in or around May 5, 2022, as a non-
21 exempt janitorial worker making \$15.00 dollars per hour.

22 21. Defendants own and operate an organization that contracts with state and local
23 businesses and government entities in the Inland Empire region to provide professional,
24 commercial cleaning services.

25 22. Defendants' main office is in Corona, California. However, their janitorial
26 workers generally drive from their homes directly to the worksites which are located throughout
27 Southern California. Although the number of worksites varied depending on the employee,
28 Plaintiff and similarly situated employees typically worked at multiple work locations in a single

1 day. Furthermore, on an average day, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees would spend
2 approximately 30 minutes or more driving to and from, and between, their assigned daily
3 worksites. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were neither paid for this travel time nor
4 were they reimbursed for mileage driving between worksites.

5 23. Despite the significant time Plaintiff and similarly situated employees spent
6 driving between worksites, it was company protocol for Plaintiff and similarly situated
7 employees to only log the time worked at the actual worksite. Specifically, Plaintiff and
8 similarly situated employees were told to log into the company's time tracking application on
9 their phones when they arrived at the first worksite, log out when they left the worksite location,
10 and then log back in when they arrived at the next worksite location. As such, this drive time
11 was not recorded in the timekeeping system and Defendant did not compensate Plaintiff and
12 similarly situated employees for this travel time.

13 24. In addition to not being paid for their travel time, Plaintiff and similarly situated
14 employees were regularly denied their meal and rest breaks, as the company considered the time
15 driving time between worksites to be the employee break time.

16 25. Finally, as mentioned above, in addition to not being paid for their drive time,
17 Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for their mileage
18 traveling to and from their assigned worksites during the workday. Defendant also failed to
19 reimburse Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for work-related cell phone use, including
20 clocking in and out of work through the E-Hub application and communicating with
21 management over text and phone.

22 26. As a result of Defendants' policies and practices described above, Plaintiff and
23 similarly situated employees were not given accurate wage statements itemizing their total
24 regular and overtime hours worked and corresponding rates of pay, or the correct gross and net
25 wages earned.

26 27. Defendants also failed to timely pay Plaintiff and similarly situated employees all
27 wages owed both during their employment and upon termination or separation, including
28 minimum and overtime wages.

28. At all times relevant herein, Defendants FELIPE ALDEA was the owner and/or managing agent of WURM'S JANITORIAL SERVICES, INC. and was acting on behalf of WURM'S JANITORIAL SERVICES, INC. when he violated and caused to be violated the below provisions of the California Labor Code.

CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

**Failure to Pay Minimum Wage
(Lab. Code, §§ 1194, 1194.2, Wage Order 5)
(As to All Defendants)**

29. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees incorporate in this cause of action each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs, as though fully set forth herein.

30. Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order 5 require employers to pay an amount equal to or greater than the minimum wage for each hour worked.

31. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and similarly situated employees at least the minimum wage for each hour worked, including their time driving between work locations.

32. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set forth herein, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees have suffered damages, including loss of earnings for time worked on behalf of Defendants.

33. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees request relief as described below.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

**Failure to Pay Overtime
(Lab. Code, §§ 510, 1194; Wage Order 5)
(As to all Defendants)**

34. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees incorporate in this cause of action each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs, as though fully set forth herein.

35. Labor Code § 510 requires employers to pay overtime compensation to all employees unless they are exempt from the overtime pay requirements. During all periods of employment, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were non-exempt employees.

36. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a

workday and forty (40) hours in a workweek.

37. Defendants failed or otherwise refused to pay Plaintiff and similarly situated employees overtime compensation at the proper rate for all overtime hours worked in the manner required by California law.

38. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set forth herein, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees have suffered damages, including loss of earnings for hours of overtime worked on behalf of Defendants.

39. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees request relief as described below.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
Inaccurate Wage Statement Penalties
(Lab. Code, § 226)
(As to All Defendants)

40. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees incorporate in this cause of action each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs, as though fully set forth herein.

41. Labor Code § 226(a) requires employers to provide employees with regular itemized written statements showing, among other things, total hours worked, all applicable hourly rates during the pay period, and the corresponding number of hours worked at each rate by the employee. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide timely, accurate itemized wage statements including this required information.

42. Labor Code § 226(e) provides that an employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with section 226(a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, up to a maximum amount of \$4,000.

43. Labor Code § 226(e)(2) provides that an employee is deemed to suffer injury for the purposes of Labor Code § 226 if the employee must refer to outside sources to determine whether their wages were correct.

44. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and similarly situated employees with their accurate itemized wage statements that would allow them to

1 readily determine whether their wages were correct.

2 45. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees request relief as described below.

3 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment**

5 **(Lab. Code, §§ 204, 210)**

6 **(As to All Defendants)**

7 46. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees incorporate in this cause of action each
8 and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs, as though fully set forth herein.

9 47. Labor Code section 204 requires employees to be paid wages at least twice per
10 month. If an employer fails to pay wages during the proper pay period, the employee is entitled
11 to a penalty of \$100 for an initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent or willful, or
12 intentional violation. Additionally, the employee is entitled to 25% of the amount unlawfully
13 withheld.

14 48. Defendants failed to properly and timely compensate Plaintiff and similarly
15 situated employees all wages earned during Plaintiff's and similarly situated employees' pay
16 period(s).

17 49. Defendants' acts were willful and/or intentional.

18 50. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are
19 entitled to the penalty set forth in section 210 of the Labor Code.

20 51. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees request relief as described below.

21 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **Unlawful Competition**

23 **(Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17200)**

24 **(As to All Defendants)**

25 52. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees incorporate in this cause of action each
26 and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs, as though fully set forth herein.

27 53. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, constitutes unlawful, unfair, and/or
28 fraudulent business practices, as set forth in Business & Professions Code § 17200. Defendants
conducted business activities while failing to comply with the legal mandates cited herein.
Plaintiff and others similarly situated suffered injury in fact and lost money as a result of

1 Defendants' unfair competition.

2 54. As a result of Defendants' unlawful and unfair business practices, Plaintiff and
3 similarly situated employees are entitled to and do seek restitution, and other appropriate relief
4 available under Business & Professions Code § 17203, on their own behalf, and on behalf of
5 others similarly situated, according to proof, for four (4) years from the filing of this Act.

6 55. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees request relief as described below.

7 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **Failure to Provide Rest Breaks (Lab. Code, § 226.7)**
9 **(As to All Defendants)**

10 56. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees incorporate in this cause of action each
11 and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs, as though fully set forth herein.

12 57. Wage Order 5 provides that all non-exempt employees are entitled to a 10-minute
13 rest break for every 4-hour shift worked by the employee.

14 58. An employer's failure to provide an opportunity to take a rest break entitles the
15 employee to an hour of pay for each day an employer fails to provide an opportunity to take a
16 rest break.

17 59. At all times Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were non-exempt and
18 entitled to rest breaks.

19 60. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees worked more than 4 hours or major
20 fraction thereof during the relevant time period and were not provided with the opportunity to
21 take compliant rest breaks.

22 61. Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for
23 the premium wage(s) owed resulting from their failure to provide the opportunity to take a rest
24 break.

25 62. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set forth
26 herein, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees have suffered damages, including a loss of
27 wages in the form of rest period premiums.

28 63. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees request relief as described below.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**Failure to Provide Meal Breaks (Lab. Code, §§ 226.7, 512)
(As to All Defendants)**

64. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees incorporate in this cause of action each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs, as though fully set forth herein.

65. Wage Order 5 provides that all non-exempt employees are entitled to a 30-minute meal break for every 5-hour shift worked by the employee.

66. An employer's failure to provide an opportunity to take a meal break entitles the employee an hour of pay for each day an employer fails to provide an opportunity to take a meal break.

67. At all times Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were non-exempt and entitled to meal breaks.

68. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees worked more than 5 hours during the relevant time period and were not provided with the opportunity to take a compliant meal break.

69. Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for the premium wage(s) owed resulting from their failure to provide them with the opportunity to take a meal break.

70. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set forth herein, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees have suffered damages, including a loss of wages in the form of meal period premiums.

71. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees request relief as described below.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**Failure to Pay Reimbursements (Lab. Code, § 2802)
(As to All Defendants)**

72. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees incorporate in this cause of action each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs, as though fully set forth herein.

73. Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to indemnify employees for any work-related expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties.

74. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees incurred expenses in the discharge of

1 their duties for which Defendants failed to reimburse them, including car mileage and work-
2 related cell phone use.

3 75. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are
4 entitled to reimbursement for work-related expenses.

5 76. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees request relief as described below.

6 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
7 **Private Attorneys General Act**
8 **(Lab. Code, §§ 2698, et seq)**
9 **(As to All Defendants)**

10 77. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees incorporate in this cause of action each
11 and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs, as though fully set forth herein.

12 78. Plaintiff has alleged to the Labor Commissioner that Defendants have violated
13 the following provisions of the Labor Code in their dealings with Plaintiff other Aggrieved
14 Employees:

- 15 • Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194; IWC Wage Order 5, § 3 (Failure to Pay Overtime
16 Wages);
- 17 • Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197.1; IWC Wage Order 5, §§ 4, (Failure to Pay
18 Minimum Wages);
- 19 • Violation of Labor Code § 226.7; IWC Wage Order 5, § 12 (Rest Period Violations);
- 20 • Violation of Labor Code §§ 512, 226.7; IWC Wage Order 5, § 11 (Meal Period
21 Violations);
- 22 • Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3 (Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements);
- 23 • Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 210 (Failure to Pay All Wages During Pay Period);
- 24 • Violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203, 256 (Failure to Pay Final Wages);
- 25 • Violation of Labor Code §§ 246, 246.5, 248.5 (Failure to Provide Paid Sick Leave at the
26 correct rate of pay);
- 27 • Violation of Labor Code § 2802 (Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses);
- 28 • Violation of Labor Code §§ 558, 558.1 (Provisions Regulating Hours and Days of Work

1 in Any Industrial Welfare Commission Order); and

- 2 • Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.3, 1174 (Failure to Maintain Accurate Records).

3 79. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendants as provided in the California
4 Labor Code, or, if no civil penalty is provided, default penalties pursuant to California Labor
5 Code section 2699(f)(2).

6 80. Plaintiff seeks these civil penalties from Defendants pursuant to California Labor
7 Code sections 2699(a) and 2699.3.

8 81. As a proximate result of the Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff and Aggrieved
9 Employees have been damaged and request relief as described below.

10 **PRAYER**

11 1. For pre-judgment, post-judgment, and statutory interest and all amounts subject
12 herein;

13 2. For equitable relief;

14 3. For special damages according to proof;

15 4. For costs of suit incurred in this action;

16 5. For attorneys' fees according to statute including, but not limited to, Code of
17 Civil Procedure section 1021.5;

18 6. For penalties according to statute;

19 7. For attorneys' fees and costs under Labor Code section 218.5; and

20 8. For all other relief that this Court deems just and proper.

21
22 **DREW LEWIS, PC**

23 Dated: August 25, 2022

24 By: 
25 Drew Lewis
26 Attorney for Plaintiff
27
28