

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)
Chloe J. Sykes, Esq. (SBN 349693)
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
csykes@lelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff JOSHUA GONZALEZ,
on behalf of himself and current and former aggrieved employees

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

JOSHUA GONZALEZ, on behalf of himself and
current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

VELOCITY VEHICLE GROUP; LOS
ANGELES TRUCK SERVICE, LLC; and DOES
1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **25STCV15907**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF JOSHUA GONZALEZ’S
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff JOSHUA GONZALEZ ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains
against Defendants VELOCITY VEHICLE GROUP; LOS ANGELES TRUCK SERVICE, 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
employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated with

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

13 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

14 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
15 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
16 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
17 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars
18 (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
19 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
20 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
21 California, including but not limited to Los Angeles County, at 2429 Peck Rd, Whittier, CA 90601.

22 **III. PARTIES**

23 1. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
24 Development Agency on behalf of himself and other current and former employees subject to
25 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
26 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work
27 for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
28 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently

1 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by
2 Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Los Angeles from in or around February
3 1, 2023, until on or about September 25, 2024.

4 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant VELOCITY
5 VEHICLE GROUP is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business
6 in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-33 are, and at all times relevant hereto
7 were persons acting on behalf of Defendant VELOCITY VEHICLE GROUP in the establishment
8 of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant
9 VELOCITY VEHICLE GROUP operates in Los Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and
10 aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County, including but not limited to, at 2429 Peck Rd,
11 Whittier, CA 90601.

12 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant LOS
13 ANGELES TRUCK SERVICE, LLC is authorized to do business within the State of California and
14 is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 34-66 are, and at all times
15 relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant LOS ANGELES TRUCK SERVICE,
16 LLC in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices
17 or policies. Defendant LOS ANGELES TRUCK SERVICE, LLC operates in Los Angeles County
18 and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County, including but not limited
19 to, at 2429 Peck Rd, Whittier, CA 90601.

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

25 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 51
26 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each of the individual defendants is sued
27 individually and in his or her capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner, representative, manager,
28 supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant who violated or caused to be

1 violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor Code and/or any provision of the
2 Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

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

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

12 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**
14 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

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

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

18 9. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges
19 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 1194,
20 1197, 1198, and the applicable Wage Orders.

21 10. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California
22 Labor Code:

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

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

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

10 (a) Defendant failed to separately compensate rest breaks for Plaintiff and other current
11 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees paid piece rate.

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

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

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

28 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) Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees overtime wages and 1.5x the regular rate of pay.

18. Furthermore, overtime is based upon an employee's regular rate of pay. "The regular rate at which an employee is employed shall be deemed to include all remuneration for employment paid to, or on behalf, of the employee." See Division of Labor Standards Enforcement – Enforcement Policies and Interpretations Manual, Section 49.1.2.

19. In this case, Plaintiff alleges that when he and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees earned overtime wages, Defendants failed to pay them overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay due to Defendants' failure to include all remuneration when calculating the overtime rate of pay. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as "production bonus" for example, when calculating Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying overtime.

20. 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.

21. **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.

22. 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 9 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.

23. 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 9 at §11.

24. 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) 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;

(b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based

1 hourly non-exempt employees a second uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes
2 for every five hours worked.

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

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

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

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

25 29. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
26 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor Code
27 section 226.7; Wage Order 9 at §12. Under California law, “[e]mployees are entitled to 10 minutes’
28 rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six

1 hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on.” *Brinker*
2 *Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code section 226.7;
3 Wage Order 9 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each work period.
4 Wage Order 9 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement “obligates employers to permit –
5 and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*,
6 (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all
7 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

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

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

16 (a) Defendant failed to separately compensate rest breaks for Plaintiff and other current
17 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees paid piece rate.

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

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

27 33. Finally, on occasions when Defendants did pay Plaintiff and other current and former
28 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a “premium” wage for late, missed, short,

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

7 34. 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 in which Defendants did not provide them with rest periods
10 in compliance with California law.

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

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

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

26 38. In this case, Plaintiff alleges that when he and other current and former aggrieved
27 California-based hourly non-exempt employees elected to use paid sick time, Defendants failed to
28 pay them sick time wages at the proper sick time rate of pay due to Defendants' failure to include

1 all remuneration when calculating the sick time rate of pay. Specifically, Defendants maintained a
2 policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration including but not limited to
3 “production bonus” for example, when calculating Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
4 California-based hourly non-exempt employees’ regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying sick
5 time.

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

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

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

25 42. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
26 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
27 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
28 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by

1 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful
2 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,
3 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor
4 Code section 1198, the Defendant secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while
5 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

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

19 **44.** As a derivative of Plaintiff's allegations above, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff
20 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
21 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period
22 premium wages) rendered Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based
23 hourly non-exempt employees' wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section
24 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

25 **45. 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 46. 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 47. Labor Code sections 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee,
7 on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees, to bring a civil action to
8 recover civil penalties against all Defendants pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code
9 section 2699.3.

10 48. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
11 section 2699.3. On March 26, 2025, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and
12 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of
13 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
14 violations alleged.

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

20 50. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
21 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7,
22 246, 510, 512, 1194, and 1198., During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present,
23 preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the
24 following amounts:

25 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, and 1198;
26 one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and
27 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent
28 violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

1 Labor Code, including but not limited to sections 210, 225.5, 226.3, 558, 2699(f);

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

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

6

7 Dated: May 30, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

8

9



10

By: _____

Joseph Lavi, Esq.

Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.

11

Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.

12

Chloe J. Sykes, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiff

13

JOSHUA GONZALEZ

on behalf of himself and current and former
aggrieved employees

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28