

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)
Christina M. Le, Esq. (SBN 237697)
Austin J. Reid, Esq. (SBN 351370)
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
jklein@lelawfirm.com
cle@lelawfirm.com
areid@lelawfirm.com

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Sonoma
5/2/2025 5:32 PM

By: Angelina Burningham, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff AUSTON S. COWAN-BENT,
on behalf of himself and current and former aggrieved employees

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

AUSTON S. COWAN-BENT, on behalf of
himself and current and former aggrieved
employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

WEST COAST CONVENIENCE, LLC; and
DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 25CV03169

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF AUSTON S. COWAN-
BENT'S COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff AUSTON S. COWAN-BENT ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and
complains against Defendants WEST COAST CONVENIENCE, LLC; 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

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

16 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

17 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
18 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
19 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
20 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars
21 (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
22 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
23 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
24 California, including but not limited to Sonoma County, at 1001 Lakeville Street, Petaluma, CA
25 94952.

26 **III. PARTIES**

27 1. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
28 Development Agency on behalf of himself and other current and former employees subject to

1 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
2 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work
3 for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
4 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently
5 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by
6 Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Sonoma County from in or around
7 September 1, 2024 until on or about January 10, 2025.

8 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant WEST COAST
9 CONVENIENCE, LLC is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing
10 business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant
11 hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant WEST COAST CONVENIENCE, LLC in the
12 establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies.
13 Defendant WEST COAST CONVENIENCE, LLC operates in Sonoma County and employed
14 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Sonoma County, including but not limited to, at 1001 Lakeville
15 Street, Petaluma, CA 94952.

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

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

27 5. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100. Plaintiff
28 sues said defendants by said fictitious names, and will amend this complaint when the true names

1 and capacities are ascertained or when such facts pertaining to liability are ascertained, or as
2 permitted by law or by the Court. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously
3 named defendants is in some manner responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this
4 complaint.

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

8 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**
10 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

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

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

14 8. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges
15 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197,
16 2802, and the applicable Wage Orders.

17 9. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California
18 Labor Code:

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

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

28 12. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly

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

6 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
7 non-exempt employees to clock out for their meal breaks and continue to work through their off-
8 the-clock meal breaks.

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

15 14. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
16 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
17 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
18 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

26 16. Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 require an employer to compensate employees a
27 higher rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, in excess of forty (40)
28 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.

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

(a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to clock out for their meal breaks and continue to work through their off-the-clock meal breaks.

18. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

21. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 7 at §11; *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. A paid "on duty" meal period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

22. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 7 at §11.

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

(a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to clock out for their meal breaks and continue to work through their off-the-clock meal breaks.

(b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees timely, uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes for every five hours worked, due to no coverage being available.

(c) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a second uninterrupted duty-free meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes for each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-

1 based hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

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

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

11 26. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
12 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
13 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
14 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

1 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

2 29. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer must
3 pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday the
4 employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7; Wage
5 Order 7 at § 12.

6 30. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit all legally required and
7 compliant rest periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
8 non-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 with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours worked
12 or major fraction thereof, due to having no coverage available.

13 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
14 hourly non-exempt employees a third uninterrupted duty-free rest period of no less than ten (10) net
15 minutes on each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
16 hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

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

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

26 33. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
27 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
28 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section

1 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

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

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

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

23 38. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
24 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
25 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
26 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

15 41. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
16 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
17 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

18 42. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
19 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
20 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
21 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by
22 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful
23 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,
24 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor
25 Code section 1198, the Defendant secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while
26 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

27 43. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
28 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section

1 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

15 45. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff
16 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
17 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period
18 premium wages) rendered Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based
19 hourly non-exempt employees’ wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section
20 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

21 46. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

22 47. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
23 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
24 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

6 50. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

7 51. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
8 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
9 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

14 53. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
15 section 2699.3. On February 25, 2025, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and
16 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of
17 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
18 violations alleged.

19 54. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by
20 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code
21 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the
22 parties notice within 60 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends
23 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

24 55. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
25 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7,
26 510, 512, and 1194, During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, preceding
27 Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the following
28 amounts:

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

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

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

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

10
11 Dated: May 2, 2025

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

12
13 By: /s/ Christina M. Le, Esq
14 Joseph Lavi, Esq.
15 Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
16 Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.
17 Christina M. Le, Esq.
18 Austin J. Reid, Esq.
19 Attorneys for Plaintiff
20 AUSTON S. COWAN-BENT,
21 on behalf of himself and current and former
22 aggrieved employees
23
24
25
26
27
28