

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)
Cassandra A. Castro, Esq. (SBN 334238)
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
ccastro@lelawfirm.com

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
5/30/2025 1:44 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By Y. Ayala, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff ROSANNA G AGUILERA,
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES- CENTRAL DISTRICT

ROSANNA G AGUILERA, on behalf of herself
and current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

YIELD ENGINEERING SYSTEMS, INC.; and
DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **25STCV15805**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF ROSANNA G
AGUILERA'S COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff ROSANNA G AGUILERA ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and
complains against Defendants YIELD ENGINEERING SYSTEMS, INC.; 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
employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated with
Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all hours
worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure to pay

1 overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay; failure to authorize or permit all legally required
2 and/or compliant meal periods or pay meal period premium wages; failure to authorize or permit
3 all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or pay rest period premium wages; failure to
4 authorize and permit all legally required and legally compliant lactation accommodation breaks
5 and/or failure to pay lactation accommodation premiums; statutory penalties for failure to timely
6 pay earned wages during employment; statutory penalties for failure to provide accurate wage
7 statements; statutory waiting time penalties in the form of continuation wages for failure to timely
8 pay employees all wages due upon separation of employment. . Plaintiff experienced these
9 violations personally, as well as is informed and believes other aggrieved employees did as well.
10 Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development
11 Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and
12 costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, 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 27963 Franklin Parkway, Valencia,
22 California 91355.

23 **III. PARTIES**

24 1. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
25 Development Agency on behalf of herself and other current and former employees subject to
26 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
27 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work
28 for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp

1 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently
2 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by
3 Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Los Angeles County from in or around
4 July 2022 until or about January 31, 2025.

5 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant YIELD
6 ENGINEERING SYSTEMS, INC. is authorized to do business within the State of California and is
7 doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times
8 relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant YIELD ENGINEERING SYSTEMS,
9 INC. in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices
10 or policies. Defendant YIELD ENGINEERING SYSTEMS, INC. operates in Los Angeles County
11 and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County, including but not limited
12 to, at 27963 Franklin Parkway, Valencia, California 91355.

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

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

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

1 complaint.

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

5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**
7 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

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

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

11 8. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges
12 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1030, 1031,
13 1033, 1194, 1197, and the applicable Wage Orders.

14 9. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California
15 Labor Code:

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

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

25 12. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
26 non-exempt employees worked more minutes per shift than Defendants credited them with having
27 worked. Specifically, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
28 California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages at the applicable minimum wage for all

1 hours worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited
2 to:

3 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
4 non-exempt employees to clock out for their meals breaks and continue to work, without being
5 paid for time worked;

6 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
7 non-exempt employees to participate in some meetings while off-the-clock, without being paid for
8 that time; and

9 (c) Scheduling mandatory meetings during Plaintiff and other current and former
10 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' meal periods.

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

17 14. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
18 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
19 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
20 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

28 16. Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 require an employer to compensate employees a

1 higher rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, in excess of forty (40)
2 hours in a workweek, and on any seventh consecutive day of work in a workweek:

3 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40) hours
4 in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in
5 any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-one-half
6 (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve (12) hours
7 in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay
8 for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a
9 workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an
10 employee.

11 Labor Code section 510.

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

15 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
16 non-exempt employees to clock out for their meals breaks and continue to work, without being
17 paid for time worked;

18 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
19 non-exempt employees to participate in some meetings while off-the-clock, without being paid for
20 that time; and

21 (c) Scheduling mandatory meetings during Plaintiff and other current and former
22 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' meal periods.

23 18. 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 19. The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each
28 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,

1 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendants failed
2 to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code
3 sections 510, 1194 and 1198, and the applicable Wage Order.

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

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

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

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

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

1 hourly non-exempt employees timely, uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes
2 for every five hours worked due to missed, late, and/or on-duty meal breaks;

3 (b) Scheduling mandatory meetings during Plaintiff and other current and former
4 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' meal periods.

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

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

14 26. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
15 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was 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 27. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
19 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant rest periods and/or failure to pay**
20 **rest period premium:** Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
21 non-exempt employees regularly worked shifts of more than three-and-a-half (3.5) hours.

22 28. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
23 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor Code
24 section 226.7; Wage Order 1 at §12. Under California law, "[e]mployees are entitled to 10 minutes'
25 rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six
26 hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on." *Brinker*
27 *Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code section 226.7;
28 Wage Order 1 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each work period.

1 Wage Order 1 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement ““obligates employers to permit –
2 and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*
3 (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all
4 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

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

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

13 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
14 hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours worked
15 or major fraction thereof due to missed, late, and/or on-duty rest breaks.

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

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

25 33. 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 34. **Failure to authorize and permit all legally required and legally compliant**
2 **lactation accommodation breaks and/or failure to pay lactation accommodation premiums:**

3 Defendants often employed non-exempt employees, including the named Plaintiff and other current
4 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees, who desired to express breast
5 milk for the employees' infant children.

6 35. California law requires every employer to provide a reasonable amount of break time
7 to accommodate an employee's desire to express breast milk for the employee's infant child each
8 time the employee needs to express milk. California law also requires that an employer provide an
9 employee with a room or location for the employee to express milk in private which shall:

10 (a) not be a bathroom, shall be in close proximity to the employee's work area, shielded
11 from view and free from intrusion while the employee is expressing milk;

12 (b) shall be safe, clean, and free of hazardous materials as defined in Labor Code section
13 6382;

14 (c) shall contain a surface to place a breast pump and personal items;

15 (d) shall contain a place to sit; and

16 (e) shall have access to electricity or alternative devices, including, but not limited to,
17 extension cords or charging stations, needed to operate an electric or battery-powered breast pump.

18 36. California law also requires the employer provide access to a sink with running water
19 and a refrigerator suitable for storing milk in close proximity to the employee's workspace or other
20 suitable cooling device if a refrigerator cannot be provided. If an employer fails to provide reasonable
21 break time or adequate space to express milk, the employer must pay the employee an additional
22 hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday the adequate space or reasonable time
23 is not provided. (Lab. Code §§1033, subd. (a), 226.7, subd. (c).)

24 37. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
25 non-exempt employees of Defendants sought to express breast milk for the employees' infant
26 children; however, Defendants employed policies, practices, and/or procedures or lack of such
27 policies, practices, and/or procedures which resulted in its failure to provide Plaintiff and other
28 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees with reasonable break

1 time for lactation or a room which complied with the requirements of California law, including but
2 not limited to, the room not being private and shielded from view or free from intrusion while the
3 employee is expressing milk. For example, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
4 California-based hourly non-exempt employees were not provided time or space to express milk, or
5 a place to store expressed milk. As an illustrative example, Plaintiff herself regularly had to use her
6 “rest period” to quickly reach her car in the parking lot, express milk, and be back at her desk prior
7 to the end of her rest period. Plaintiff was also not provided a space in which to store her expressed
8 milk and had to purchase a cooler to keep on her person at work to preserve her expressed milk.

9 38. Additionally, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former
10 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees an additional hour of pay at their regular
11 rate of compensation for each workday the employees did not receive all legally required and
12 compliant lactation periods, i.e., legally compliant time or space. Defendants employed policies and
13 procedures which ensured that employees did not receive any lactation period premium wages to
14 compensate them for workdays in which they did not receive all legally required and compliant
15 lactation periods.

16 39. The aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures of Defendants resulted in
17 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not
18 being provided with all legally required and compliant lactation periods and/or not receiving
19 premium wages to compensate them for such instances, all in violation of California law.

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

1 41. As a derivative of Plaintiff's claims above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to
2 timely pay Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
3 employees' earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages
4 and/or rest period premium wages), in violation of Labor Code section 204. Defendants'
5 aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in their failure to pay Plaintiff's and
6 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' their earned
7 wages within the applicable time frames outlined in Labor Code section 204.

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

11 43. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
12 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
13 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
14 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by
15 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful
16 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,
17 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor
18 Code section 1198, the Defendant secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while
19 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

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

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

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

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

47. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

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

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

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

51. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

52. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.

1 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
2 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

7 54. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
8 section 2699.3. On March 25, 2025, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and
9 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of
10 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
11 violations alleged.

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

17 56. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
18 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7,
19 510, 512, and 1194, During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, preceding
20 Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the following
21 amounts:

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

26 b. For violations of Labor Code section 226(a), alternatively, two hundred fifty
27 dollars (\$250) for each employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each
28 subsequent violation, one thousand dollars (\$1000) for each underpaid employee for each pay period

[penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 226.3].

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

d. For violations of Labor Code section 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 210].

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

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

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

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

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

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

3
4 Dated: May 30, 2025

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

5
6 By: /s/Cassandra A. Castro
7 Joseph Lavi, Esq.
8 Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
9 Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.
10 Cassandra A. Castro, Esq.
11 Attorneys for Plaintiff
12 ROSANNA G AGUILERA,
13 on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved
14 employees
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28