

1 **JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.**

William C. Sung, SB# 280792

2 E-Mail: william@justiceforworkers.com

Tiffany L. Luu, SB# 335127

3 E-Mail: tluu@justiceforworkers.com

Joseph C. Ramli, SB# 339491

4 E-Mail: jramli@justiceforworkers.com

9575 Bolsa Avenue

5 Westminster, CA 92683

Tel: 323-922-2000

6 Fax: 323-922-2000

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff BOGYEONG PARK

8
9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

10 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

11 BOGYEONG PARK, an individual and on
12 behalf of all others similarly situated;

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 HANMI BANK, a California corporation; and
16 DOES 1 through 50,

17 Defendants.

Case No.: 25STCV06249

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

- 18 (1) **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 204, 510, 1194,
1198);
- 19 (2) **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512, 558);
- 20 (3) **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 516, 558);
- 21 (4) **WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES**
(LABOR CODE § 226);
- 22 (5) **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**
(LABOR CODE §§ 201-203);
- 23 (6) **UNFAIR COMPETITION (BUS &
PROF CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*); and**
- 24 (7) **CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE
CALIFORNIA PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT
(LABOR CODE §§ 2698, *et seq.*)**

25 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

1 Plaintiff BOGYEONG PARK (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself and all others similarly
2 situated, hereby brings this First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint
3 (“Complaint”) against Defendants HANMI BANK, a California corporation, and DOES 1 to 50
4 (collectively “Defendants”), and on information and belief alleges as follows:

5 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

6 1. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, hereby brings this
7 Complaint for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under California Business and Professions
8 Code § 17200, *et seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1198, 2802,
9 2698, *et seq.*, and Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order 4-2001 (“Wage Order 4”),
10 in addition to seeking injunctive relief, declaratory relief, and restitution. This Complaint is brought
11 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants’
12 violations of the Labor Code because the amount in controversy exceeds \$25,000.

13 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district because Defendants maintain offices, have
14 agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, including Los Angeles County, and some
15 of the acts and omissions complained of herein occurred in Los Angeles County. Furthermore,
16 Plaintiff was employed by Defendants within Los Angeles County.

17 **PARTIES**

18 3. Plaintiff is, and at all times relevant herein was, an individual over the age of
19 eighteen (18) and is a California resident. Within the statute of limitations periods applicable to
20 each cause of action pled herein, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee.
21 Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or customs complained of
22 herein and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed by Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et*
23 *seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1198, 2802, 2698, *et seq.*, and
24 Wage Order 4.

25 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the
26 applicable statute of limitations for each cause of action pled herein and continuing to the present,
27 Defendants engaged in, and continue to engage in, business, and employed Plaintiff and other,
28 similarly-situated non-exempt employees within Los Angeles County, and the State of California

1 and, therefore, were (and are) doing business in Los Angeles County and the State of California.

2 5. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or
3 corporate, of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 50, inclusive, and for that reason, said
4 defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to
5 amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed and
6 believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious defendants, whether individual,
7 partners, or corporate, was responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein,
8 and proximately caused Plaintiff and the Classes (as defined below) to be subject to the unlawful
9 employment practices, wrongs, injuries, and damages complained of herein.

10 6. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of
11 the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendant; and furthermore,
12 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each of the other
13 defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned, were acting
14 within the course and scope of said agency and employment.

15 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
16 material hereto, each of the Defendants named herein was the agent, employee, alter ego and/or
17 joint venturer of, or working in concert with each of the other co-Defendants and was acting within
18 the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity. To the extent
19 said acts, conduct, and omissions were perpetrated by certain Defendants, each of the remaining
20 Defendants confirmed and ratified said acts, conduct, and omissions of the acting Defendants.

21 8. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were members of, and
22 engaged in, a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course and
23 scope of, and in pursuance of, said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise.

24 9. At all times herein mentioned, the acts and omissions of various Defendants, and
25 each of them, concurred and contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and all of the
26 other Defendants in proximately causing the injuries and damages as herein alleged.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

2 10. Defendants own and operate banks in California and is headquartered in Los
3 Angeles. Defendants has employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee since approximately May
4 30, 2023 as a credit analyst.

5 11. Throughout Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Defendants' timekeeping
6 and/or payroll policies and practices resulted in Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees not being
7 compensated for all overtime hours actually worked. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees
8 regularly worked more than eight hours in a workday or 40 hours in a workweek. Upon information
9 and belief, Defendants also failed to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary
10 remuneration into the regular rate of pay. As a result, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees
11 were not compensated for all earned overtime wages.

12 12. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with all
13 legally compliant meal periods due to Defendants' meal period policies/practices, which have
14 frequently resulted in late (commencing after the fifth hour of work), short (less than 30 minutes),
15 and/or missed meal periods. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff and other non-exempt
16 employees were not able to take their legally compliant meal breaks due to work demands imposed
17 by Defendants. Upon information and belief, Defendants violated Labor Code § 226.7 by failing to
18 pay meal period premiums at the correct regular rate of compensation by incorporating all non-
19 discretionary incentive compensation in the event that a legally compliant meal period was not
20 provided to their non-exempt employees.

21 13. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not authorized and permitted to take
22 all required rest periods due to Defendants' unlawful rest period policies/practices, which failed to
23 authorize and permit a net 10-minute rest period for every four hours worked, or major fraction
24 thereof. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not able to take their legally compliant rest
25 breaks due to work demands imposed by Defendants. Upon information and belief, Defendants
26 violated Labor Code § 226.7 by failing to pay rest period premiums at the correct regular rate of
27 compensation by incorporating all non-discretionary incentive compensation in the event that a
28 legally compliant meal period was not provided to their non-exempt employees.

14. Additionally, upon information and belief, Defendants violated Labor Code § 246 by failing to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration into the paid sick leave pay rate.

15. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay all overtime wages, failure to pay all meal and rest period premium wages, and unlawful timekeeping and payroll practices as alleged above, Defendants maintained inaccurate payroll records and issued inaccurate wage statements to Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees. As a further result of Defendants' failure to pay all overtime wages, sick leave wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, Defendants failed to timely pay all final wages to other former non-exempt employees upon their separation of employment from Defendants.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

16. **Class Definitions:** Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and the following Classes pursuant to § 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure:

- a. Overtime Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who worked more than eight hours per day and/or 40 hours per week and received non-discretionary incentive compensation during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- b. Meal Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who received meal period premiums and non-discretionary incentive compensation during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- c. Rest Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who received rest period premiums and non-discretionary incentive compensation during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- d. Wage Statement Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who received non-discretionary incentive compensation and wage statements, during the one year immediately preceding the filing of this

1 action through the present.

- 2 e. Waiting Time Penalty Class: All of Defendants' formerly employed members of the
3 Overtime Class, Rest Period Class, and/or Meal Period Class during the three years
4 immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.

5 17. **Numerosity/Ascertainability**: The members of the Classes are so numerous that
6 joinder of all members would be impractical, if not impossible. The membership of the Classes is
7 unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, it is estimated that the members of the Classes number
8 greater than 50 individuals. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection
9 of Defendants' employment records, including payroll records.

10 18. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well-Defined Community of**
11 **Interest**: There are predominant common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and members of
12 the Classes, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members including,
13 without limitation to:

- 14 a. Whether Defendants properly paid all overtime wages to members of the Overtime
15 Class;
16 b. Whether Defendants provided all legally compliant meal periods or paid meal period
17 premium wages due to members of the Meal Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§
18 226.7 and 512;
19 c. Whether Defendants authorized and permitted all legally compliant rest periods or
20 paid all rest period premium wages due to members of the Rest Period Class
21 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;
22 d. Whether Defendants furnished legally compliant wage statements to members of the
23 Wage Statement Class pursuant to Labor Code § 226; and
24 e. Whether Defendants timely paid all final wages to members of the Waiting Time
25 Class at the time of their separation of employment pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201
26 and 202.

27 These common questions of law and fact set forth above are numerous and substantial and
28 stem from Defendants' policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member. As

1 such, the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual
2 class member's showing as to their eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of their damages.

3 19. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Classes because
4 Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the statute(s)
5 of limitations period applicable to each cause of action pled in the Complaint. As alleged herein,
6 Plaintiff, like the members of the Classes, was not paid all overtime wages owed due to Defendants'
7 timekeeping and payroll policies/practices, did not receive premium pay for non-compliant meal
8 and rest periods, and not provided with accurate, compliant, itemized wage statements.

9 20. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary steps
10 to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the members of the Classes. Moreover, Plaintiff's
11 attorneys are ready, willing and able to fully and adequately represent the members of the Classes
12 and Plaintiff. Plaintiff's attorneys have litigated numerous wage-and-hour class actions in state and
13 federal courts in the past and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the
14 members of the Classes.

15 21. **Superiority:** The Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves an important
16 public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California. These laws
17 and labor standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers who
18 have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to take advantage of superior economic
19 and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of employment. The nature of this
20 action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff and members of the Classes make the class
21 action format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to redress the violations alleged
22 herein. If each employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily
23 gain an unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited
24 resources of each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources.

25 22. Moreover, requiring each member of the Class(es) to pursue an individual remedy
26 would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file
27 an action against their former and/or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and
28 permanent damages to their careers at subsequent employment. The claims of the individual

1 members of the Class are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual prosecution
2 considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending hereto.

3 23. Furthermore, the prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members,
4 even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications
5 with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; and which would establish
6 potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or legal determinations with
7 respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interest
8 of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which would substantially impair or
9 impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. As such, the Classes identified
10 hereinabove are maintainable as classes under § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS**

13 **(Against All Defendants)**

14 24. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
15 fully set forth herein.

16 25. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1198, and
17 Wage Order 4, § 3, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to all overtime wages
18 and compensation for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure
19 to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

20 26. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly compensate non-
21 exempt employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class, for all overtime hours
22 worked pursuant to Labor Code § 1194 and Wage Order 4. Wage Order 4, § 3 requires an employer
23 to pay an employee one and one-half (1½) times and two times the employee's regular rate of pay
24 for overtime and double time hours work. Defendants caused Plaintiff and members of the Overtime
25 Class to work overtime hours but failed to compensate these employees for all overtime hours
26 actually worked.

27 27. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of overtime wages, Plaintiff and
28 members of the Overtime Class seek recovery of the balance of unpaid overtime wages, including

1 interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§
2 204, 210, 216, 218.6, 510, 1194, and 1198; Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and Civil Code §§
3 3287 and 3289.

4 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

6 **(Against All Defendants)**

7 28. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
8 fully set forth herein.

9 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed
10 in their affirmative obligation to provide all of their non-exempt employees in California, including
11 Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class, with all legally compliant meal periods in
12 accordance with the mandates of the Labor Code and Wage Order 4, § 11.

13 30. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants did not pay an additional hour of pay to
14 Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class at their respective regular rates of compensation, in
15 accordance with California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226.7, and 512.

16 31. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful meal period practices, Plaintiff and
17 members of the Meal Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for meal period
18 violations including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, pursuant to Labor Code
19 §§ 226.7, 512, 558, Wage Order 4, and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289.

20 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

22 **(Against All Defendants)**

23 32. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
24 fully set forth herein.

25 33. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and Wage Order 4, § 12 and establish the right of
26 employees to be provided with a rest period of at least 10 minutes for each four-hour period
27 worked, or major fraction thereof. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
28 despite Defendants' failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class

1 to take all legally compliant rest periods as alleged herein, Defendants did not pay these individuals
2 an additional hour of pay at their respective regular rate for the rest periods that they failed to
3 authorize and permit them to take, as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

4 34. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful rest period practices, Plaintiff and
5 members of the Rest Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for rest period violations
6 including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees,
7 and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, Wage Order 4, and Civil Code §§
8 3287 and 3289.

9 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
10 **WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES**
11 **(Against All Defendants)**

12 35. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
13 fully set forth herein.

14 36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
15 knowingly and intentionally, as a matter of uniform policy and practice, failed to furnish Plaintiff
16 and members of the Wage Statement Class with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements
17 that included, among other requirements, all hours worked, total gross wages earned, all rates of pay
18 and corresponding number of hours worked, total net wages earned, the inclusive dates of the pay
19 period, and/or the correct name and address of the legal entity that is the employer in violation of
20 Labor Code § 226.

21 37. Defendants' failure to furnish Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Class
22 with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements resulted in actual injury, as said failures led
23 to, among other things, the non-payment of overtime wages and meal and rest period premium
24 wages owed and deprived them of the information necessary to identify the discrepancies in
25 Defendants' reported payroll data.

26 38. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful wage statement practices, Plaintiff and
27 members of the Wage Statement Class seek damages and/or statutory penalties, reasonable
28 attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code § 226.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
WAITING TIME PENALTIES
(Against All Defendants)

39. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

40. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201-203, which require an employer to pay all wages immediately at the time of separation of employment in the event the employer discharges the employee or the employee provides at least 72 hours of notice of their intent to quit. In the event the employee provides less than 72 hours of notice of their intent to quit, said employee's wages become due and payable not later than 72 hours upon said employee's last date of employment.

41. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed to timely pay members of the Waiting Time Class all final wages due to them at their separation from employment, including unpaid overtime wages as well as unpaid meal and rest period premium wages.

42. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that as a matter of uniform policy and practice, Defendants continue to fail to pay members of the Waiting Time Class all earned wages at the end of employment in a timely manner pursuant to the requirements of Labor Code §§ 201-202.

43. Defendants' failure to pay all final wages was willful within the meaning of Labor Code § 203. Defendants' willful failure to timely pay members of the Waiting Time Class their earned wages upon separation from employment results in continued payment of daily wages up to thirty days from the time the wages were due.

44. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful practices, members of the Waiting Time Class seek statutory penalties, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code § 203.

///

///

///

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 45. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
5 fully set forth herein.

6 46. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business
7 practices in California in violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, by:

- 8 a. failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class all overtime wages due;
9 b. failing to provide Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class with all meal
10 periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all meal period premium
11 wages due;
12 c. failing to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class all rest
13 periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all rest period premium
14 wages due;
15 d. failing to issue accurate and itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and members of
16 the Wage Statement Class; and
17 e. failing to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time
18 Penalty Class.

19 47. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived
20 Plaintiff and continues to deprive members of the Classes of compensation to which they are legally
21 entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage over
22 Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers and attempting to
23 do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws.

24 48. Because Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged
25 herein, Plaintiff for himself and on behalf of the members of the Classes, seeks full restitution of
26 monies, as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired
27 and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17208.

28 ///

1 49. The acts complained of herein occurred within the last four years immediately
2 preceding the filing of the Complaint in this action.

3 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

5 **(Against All Defendants)**

6 50. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
7 fully set forth herein.

8 51. Plaintiff, an “aggrieved employee” within the meaning of Labor Code §§ 2698, *et*
9 *seq.*, acting on behalf of herself and other aggrieved employees (collectively, “Aggrieved
10 Employees”), brings this representative action against Defendants to recover the civil penalties due
11 to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant
12 to Labor Code §§ 558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial
13 violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or
14 intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210 and/or 225.5 for each failure to pay each
15 employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and
16 \$100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3)
17 \$100 for each initial violation and \$250 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code §
18 1197.1 per employee per pay period; (4) \$250 for each initial violation and \$1,000 for each
19 subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to
20 Labor Code § 256, a civil penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as
21 waiting time under the terms of Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) \$100 for each initial violation and
22 \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor
23 Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided, based on the following Labor Code
24 violations:

- 25 a. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned overtime compensation in violation
26 of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
- 27 b. Failing to provide all legally required meal periods, and failure to pay meal period
28 premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of compensation in

violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, and 1198;

- c. Failing to authorize and permit all legally required rest periods, and failure to pay rest period premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198;
- d. Failing to furnish Aggrieved Employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226;
- e. Failing to timely pay all final wages and compensation earned by Aggrieved Employees at the time of separation in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-202;
- f. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all paid sick leave wages in violation of Labor Code § 246;
- g. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned wages at least twice during each calendar month in violation of Labor Code § 204; and
- h. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1198.

52. On or about March 5, 2025, Plaintiff notified Defendants via certified mail, and notified the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) via its website, of Defendants’ violations of the Labor Code and Plaintiff’s intent to bring a claim for civil penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* with respect to the violations of the Labor Code identified in the preceding paragraph. Now that 33 days and 65 days have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendants and the LWDA of these violations, Defendants have not cured any curable violations, and the LWDA has not provided notice that it intends to investigate the violations, Plaintiff has exhausted administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act with respect to these violations.

53. Plaintiff has incurred attorneys’ fees and costs, which Plaintiff is entitled to receive under California Labor Code § 2699(g).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for herself and for all others on whose behalf this suit is brought against Defendants, as follows:

1. For an order certifying the proposed Classes;
2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the Classes;
3. For an order appointing Counsel for Plaintiff as Counsel for the Classes;
4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for payment of overtime wages and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for meal period premium wages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558;
6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for rest period premium wages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558;
7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226;
8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203;
9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiff and members of the Classes of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or practices declared by this Court to be in violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;
10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210 and/or 225.5 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$250.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per employee per pay period; (4) \$250.00 for each initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to Labor Code § 256, a civil penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as

1 waiting time under the terms of Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) \$100.00 for each initial violation and
2 \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor
3 Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided;

4 11. Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6
5 and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289;

6 12. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code §§
7 218.5, 226, 1194, 2699(g), and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and


8 13. For such other and further relief, the Court may deem just and proper.

9 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

10 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all claims.

11
12 DATED: May 12, 2025

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.

13
14 By: 

15 William C. Sung

16 Tiffany L. Luu

17 Joseph C. Ramli

18 Attorneys for Plaintiff BOGYEONG PARK
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE
BOGYEONG PARK v. HANMI BANK
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 3600 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1815, Los Angeles, CA 90010.

On May 12, 2025 I served the foregoing document described as:

FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT

☐ by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail in the State of California addressed as set forth below:

☐ by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as stated on the attached mailing list.

☒ by electronically serving the document(s) listed above to:

Gene Ryu
Gene.Ryu@klgates.com

Attorneys for Defendant HANMI BANK

Jess Kang
Jess.Kang@klgates.com

Carter Norfleet
Carter.Norfleet@klgates.com

Dyana Estrada
Dyana.Estrada@klgates.com

K&L GATES LLP
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., 8th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067

☐ by having copies **personally delivered to the designed party(ies)**

As follows: I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on the same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

☒ (State) I declare under penalty of perjury the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

☐ (Federal) I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made

Executed on May 12, 2025 in Los Angeles, California.



Anayeli Ascencio