

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)
J. Jason Hill, Esq. (SBN 179630)

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
jhill@lelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff RACHEL PEREZ CAMILOSA,
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN**

RACHEL PEREZ CAMILOSA, on behalf of
herself and current and former aggrieved
employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

STOCKTON REGIONAL REHABILITATION
HOSPITAL, LLC; ERNEST HEALTH ES, LLC;
and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: STK-CV-UOE-2025-0005703

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF RACHEL PEREZ
CAMILOSA'S COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff RACHEL PEREZ CAMILOSA ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and
complains against Defendants STOCKTON REGIONAL REHABILITATION HOSPITAL, LLC;
ERNEST HEALTH ES, 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, herself
and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-exempt

Electronically Filed
Superior Court of California
County of San Joaquin
2025-04-21 16:39:05
Clerk: Kacey Sutton

Case Management Conference
2025-10-17 8:30AM in 11B

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; failure to pay wages for accrued paid sick time at the regular rate of pay; statutory
9 penalties for failure to timely pay earned wages during employment; statutory penalties for failure
10 to provide accurate wage statements; statutory waiting time penalties in the form of continuation
11 wages for failure to timely pay employees all wages due upon separation of employment. . Plaintiff
12 experienced these violations personally, as well as is informed and believes other aggrieved
13 employees did as well. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and
14 Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code
15 section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others
16 aggrieved.

17 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

18 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
19 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
20 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
21 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars
22 (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
23 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
24 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
25 California, including but not limited to San Joaquin County, at 607 E Magnolia St. Stockton, CA
26 95202.

27 **III. PARTIES**

28 1. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce

1 Development Agency on behalf of herself and other current and former employees subject to
2 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
3 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work
4 for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
5 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently
6 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by
7 Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in San Joaquin County from in or around
8 September 2023 until on or about currently.

9 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant STOCKTON
10 REGIONAL REHABILITATION HOSPITAL, LLC is authorized to do business within the State
11 of California and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-33 are,
12 and at all times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant STOCKTON
13 REGIONAL REHABILITATION HOSPITAL, LLC in the establishment of, or ratification of, the
14 aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant STOCKTON REGIONAL
15 REHABILITATION HOSPITAL, LLC operates in San Joaquin County and employed Plaintiff and
16 aggrieved employees in San Joaquin County, including but not limited to, at 607 E Magnolia St.,
17 Stockton, CA 95202.

18 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant ERNEST
19 HEALTH ES, LLC is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business
20 in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 37-66 are, and at all times relevant hereto
21 were persons acting on behalf of Defendant ERNEST HEALTH ES, LLC in the establishment of,
22 or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant
23 ERNEST HEALTH ES, LLC operates in San Joaquin County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved
24 employees in San Joaquin County, including but not limited to, at 607 E Magnolia St., Stockton,
25 CA 95202.

26 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 1
27 through 66 are corporations, or are other business entities or organizations of a nature unknown to
28 Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California non-exempt employees, permitted

1 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised control over the wages, hours and working
2 conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

3 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 67
4 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each of the individual defendants is sued
5 individually and in his or her capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner, representative, manager,
6 supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant who violated or caused to be
7 violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor Code and/or any provision of the
8 Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

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

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

18 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**
20 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

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

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

24 9. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges
25 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 1194,
26 1197, 2802, and the applicable Wage Orders.

27 10. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California
28 Labor Code:

1 11. **Failure to pay wages for all hours worked at the legal minimum wage:**
2 Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt
3 employees. In California, an employer is required to pay hourly employees for all “hours worked,”
4 which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the employee
5 is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either directly or
6 indirectly, performing services which inure to the benefit of the employer.

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

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

16 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
17 non-exempt employees to take calls while off-the clock regarding work-related issues without being
18 paid for that time.

19 14. 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 15. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
26 Employer’s conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
27 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
28 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

1 16. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay**
2 **and/or failure to pay overtime wages at the proper rate of pay:** Defendants employed many of
3 their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt employees. In California, an employer
4 is required to pay hourly employees for all “hours worked,” which includes all time that an employee
5 is under control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered and permitted to work. This
6 includes the time an employee spends, either directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to
7 the benefit of the employer.’

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

11 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40) hours
12 in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in
13 any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-one-half
14 (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve (12) hours
15 in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay
16 for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a
17 workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an
18 employee.

19 Labor Code section 510.

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

23 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
24 non-exempt employees to take calls while off-the clock regarding work-related issues without being
25 paid for that time.

26 19. 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
29 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

30 20. Furthermore, overtime is based upon an employee’s regular rate of pay. “The regular
31 rate at which an employee is employed shall be deemed to include all remuneration for employment

1 paid to, or on behalf, of the employee.” See Division of Labor Standards Enforcement –
2 Enforcement Policies and Interpretations Manual, Section 49.1.2.

3 21. In this case, Plaintiff alleges that when she and other current and former aggrieved
4 California-based hourly non-exempt employees earned overtime wages, Defendants failed to pay
5 them overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay due to Defendants’ failure to include all
6 remuneration when calculating the overtime rate of pay. Specifically, Defendants maintained a
7 policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as shift premium pay
8 for example, when calculating Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based
9 hourly non-exempt employees’ regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying overtime.

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

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

23 24. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an
24 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of
25 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee’s activities prior to the
26 employee’s sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 5 at §11;
27 *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ
28 an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee

1 with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh
2 hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period
3 shall be considered an “on duty” meal period and counted as time worked. A paid “on duty” meal
4 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved
5 of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

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

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

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

17 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
18 non-exempt employees to remain on-duty during their off-the-clock meal breaks because Plaintiff
19 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees were
20 required to keep their personal cell phone on them at all times during their shift to monitor and
21 respond to calls from Defendant, including during their off-the-clock meal breaks.

22 (c) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
23 hourly non-exempt employees a second uninterrupted duty-free meal period of no less than thirty
24 (30) minutes for each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
25 based hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

26 27. 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-based
28 hourly non-exempt employees one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday that

1 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees did
2 not receive legally required and compliant meal periods, in violation of Labor Code section 226.7.

3 28. Finally, on occasions when Defendants paid Plaintiff and other current and former
4 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a “premium” wage for late, missed, short,
5 on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted meal periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1) additional
6 hour of pay at Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
7 exempt employees’ regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy,
8 practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as shift premium pay for
9 example, when calculating Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based
10 hourly non-exempt employees’ regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying meal period premium
11 wages.

12 29. Defendants’ foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff and
13 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not receiving
14 wages to compensate them for workdays during which Defendants did not provide them with meal
15 periods in compliance with California law.

16 30. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
17 Employer’s conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
18 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
19 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

24 32. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
25 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor Code
26 section 226.7; Wage Order 5 at §12. Under California law, “[e]mployees are entitled to 10 minutes’
27 rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six
28 hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on.” *Brinker*

1 *Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code section 226.7;
2 Wage Order 5 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each work period.
3 Wage Order 5 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement “obligates employers to permit –
4 and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*,
5 (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all
6 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

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

11 34. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit all legally required and
12 compliant rest periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
13 non-exempt employees due to Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not
14 limited to:

15 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
16 hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours worked
17 or major fraction thereof worked due to chronic understaffing.

18 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
19 non-exempt employees to remain on-duty during their rest breaks because Plaintiff and other current
20 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees were required to keep their
21 personal cell phone on them at all times during their shift to monitor and respond to calls from
22 Defendant, including during their rest breaks.

23 35. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
24 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
25 hourly non-exempt employees with one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday
26 they did not receive legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor Code section
27 226.7.

28 36. Finally, on occasions when Defendants did pay Plaintiff and other current and former

1 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a “premium” wage for late, missed, short,
2 on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted rest periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1) additional
3 hour of pay at Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
4 exempt employees’ regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy,
5 practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such shift premium pay for example,
6 when calculating Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
7 exempt employees’ regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying rest period premiums.

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

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

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

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

25 (a) requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
26 non-exempt employees to use or purchase their own tools and/or resources in order to work for
27 Defendants, including but not limited to personal cellphone usage for work-related purposes -
28 without reimbursing Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-

1 exempt employees for such use.

2 41. Moreover, Defendants employed policies and procedures which ensured Plaintiff and
3 aggrieved employees would not receive indemnification for their employment related expenses.
4 This practice resulted in Plaintiff and aggrieved employees not receiving such indemnification in
5 compliance with California law.

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

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

13 44. **Failure to provide sick pay wages:** Defendants had a policy and/or procedure where
14 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
15 accrued paid sick time.

16 45. Labor Code section 246, subdivision (a), states in relevant part "[a]n employee
17 who...works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the
18 commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days." Additionally, an employee accrues
19 paid sick days at the rate of no-less-than one (1) hour per every thirty (30) hours worked, beginning
20 at the commencement of employment. Labor Code section 246(b).

21 46. Here, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
22 exempt employees were employed by Defendants for 30 or more days and were entitled to paid sick
23 days. Defendants, however, lacked a policy, practice, and/or procedure whereby Plaintiffs and other
24 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees who were employed
25 by Defendants for 30 days or more could accrue paid sick days at the rate of no-less-than one (1)
26 hour per every thirty (30) hours worked, beginning at the commencement of employment as required
27 by Labor Code section 246(b).

28 47. In this case, Plaintiff alleges that when she and other current and former aggrieved

1 California-based hourly non-exempt employees elected to use paid sick time, Defendants failed to
2 pay them sick time wages at the proper sick time rate of pay due to Defendants' failure to include
3 all remuneration when calculating the sick time rate of pay. Specifically, Defendants maintained a
4 policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration including but not limited to
5 shift premium pay for example, when calculating Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
6 California-based hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying sick
7 time.

8 48. Defendants' foregoing policy, practice, and/or procedure resulted in Defendants
9 failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
10 exempt employees' paid sick days, in violation of Labor Code section 246.

11 49. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
12 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
13 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

23 51. As a derivative of Plaintiff's claims above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to
24 timely pay Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
25 employees' earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages
26 and/or rest period premium wages), in violation of Labor Code section 204. Defendants'
27 aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in their failure to pay Plaintiff's and
28 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' their earned

1 wages within the applicable time frames outlined in Labor Code section 204.

2 52. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
3 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
4 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

5 53. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
6 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
7 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
8 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by
9 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful
10 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,
11 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor
12 Code section 1198, the Defendant secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while
13 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

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

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

1 worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

2 56. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff
3 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
4 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period
5 premium wages) rendered Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based
6 hourly non-exempt employees’ wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section
7 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

8 57. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

9 58. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
10 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
11 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

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

22 62. 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 63. Labor Code sections 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee,
26 on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees, to bring a civil action to
27 recover civil penalties against all Defendants pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code
28 section 2699.3.

1 64. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
2 section 2699.3. On February 12, 2025, 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 65. 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 66. 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, 223, 226(a), 226.7,
13 246, 510, 512, and 1194, During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present,
14 preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the
15 following amounts:

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

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

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

28 d. For violations of Labor Code section 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for

1 each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, or any
2 willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee,
3 plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code
4 section 210].

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

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

12 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

13 **WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HERSELF AND ON OTHER AGGRIEVED**
14 **EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:**

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

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

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

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

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

1 Dated: April 21, 2025

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

J. Jason Hill, Esq.

By:

Joseph Lavi, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.
J. Jason Hill, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
RACHEL PEREZ CAMILOSA,
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved
employees

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28