

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jeffrey M. Schwartz, Esq. (SBN 254916)
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
jschwartz@lelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff VANNO PLONG,
on behalf of himself/herself and current and former aggrieved employees

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

VANNO PLONG, on behalf of himself and
current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

GOLDEN STATE SUPPLY LLC; and DOES 1
to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **24STCV18277**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF VANNO PLONG'S
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff VANNO PLONG ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains on
information and belief except as to those allegations relating to plaintiff himself/herself, which are
asserted on personal knowledge, against Defendants GOLDEN STATE SUPPLY LLC; and DOES
1 to 100, inclusive (collectively "Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

- 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,

1 himself/herself and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as
2 hourly non-exempt employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties
3 associated with Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay
4 wages for all hours worked at the employees' minimum wage rate or overtime rate, failure to
5 provide all legally required and legally compliant meal and rest periods, failure to timely pay
6 earned wages during employment, failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements,
7 failure to timely pay all unpaid wages following separation of employment. Plaintiff seeks on a
8 representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil
9 penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought
10 on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

11 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

12 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
13 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
14 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
15 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of thirty-five thousand dollars
16 (\$35,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
17 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
18 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
19 California, including but not limited to Los Angeles County, at 1315 Pacific Coast Highway Suite
20 101, Harbor City, CA 90710.

21 **III. PARTIES**

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

1 employed by Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Los Angeles County
2 from approximately October 31, 2023 until on or about November 24, 2023.

3
4 4. Defendant GOLDEN STATE SUPPLY LLC is authorized to do business within the
5 State of California and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES
6 1-50 are, and at all times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant GOLDEN
7 STATE SUPPLY LLC in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage
8 and hour practices or policies. Defendant GOLDEN STATE SUPPLY LLC operates Los Angeles
9 County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County including but not
10 limited to, at 1315 Pacific Coast Highway Suite 101, Harbor City, CA 90710.

11 5. Defendants DOES 1 through 50 are corporations or other business entities or
12 organizations of a nature unknown to Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California
13 non-exempt employees, permitted Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised
14 control over the wages, hours and working conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved
15 employees.

16 6. Defendants DOES 51 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each
17 Defendant is sued individually and in their capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner,
18 representative, manager, supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant
19 who violated or caused to be violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor
20 Code and/or any provision of the Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours
21 and days of work.

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

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

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

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

9. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges each and every allegation contained in this pleading as though fully set forth herein.

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

11. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California Labor Code:

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

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

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

(a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly

1 non-exempt employees who worked opening shifts to unlock store and disarm the alarm prior to
2 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
3 being able to clock in for the start of their shift without being paid for that time;

4 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
5 non-exempt employees who worked closing shifts to clock out and then do rounds, check the
6 restrooms, check the back of stores, make sure all doors closed, set the alarm, exit, put the gate
7 down in front store after clocking out for the end of their shift and without being paid for that
8 time.

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

16 16. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay:**
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
20 employee is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either
21 directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to the benefit of the employer.

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

25 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40)
26 hours in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of
27 work in any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-
28 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 § 510.

1
2
3 18. In this case, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former
4 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees overtime wages for all overtime hours
5 worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to,

6 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
7 non-exempt employees who worked opening shifts to unlock store and disarm the alarm prior to
8 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
9 being able to clock in for the start of their shift without being paid for that time;

10 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
11 non-exempt employees who worked closing shifts to clock out and then do rounds, check the
12 restrooms, check the back of stores, make sure all doors closed, set the alarm, exit, put the gate
13 down in front store after clocking out for the end of their shift and without being paid for that
14 time.

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

19 20. In this case, Plaintiff alleges that when he and other current and former aggrieved
20 California-based hourly non-exempt employees earned overtime wages, Defendants failed to pay
21 them overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay due to Defendants' failure to include all
22 remuneration when calculating the overtime rate of pay. Specifically, Defendants maintained a
23 policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as hourly non-exempt
24 employees' bonuses based on hours worked and hourly non-exempt general managers' bonuses
25 based on store performance, for example, when calculating Plaintiff's and other current and
26 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of pay for the
27 purpose of paying overtime.

28 21. 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

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

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

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

24 24. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
25 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay
26 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
27 §§ 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 7 at § 11.

28 25. 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-

1 exempt employees due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures, including but not
2 limited to,

3 (a) failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
4 hourly non-exempt employees timely, uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks due to Plaintiff and
5 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees being
6 subjected to missed or late meal breaks and/or being required to remain on duty due to chronic
7 understaffing.

8 (b) failure to include hourly non-exempt employees' bonuses based on hours
9 worked and hourly non-exempt general managers' bonuses based on store performance in the
10 regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating and paying meal break premium wages;

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

17 27. Finally, on occasions when Defendants paid Plaintiff and other current and former
18 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a "premium" wage for late, missed,
19 short, on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted meal periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1)
20 additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based
21 hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained
22 a policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as hourly non-
23 exempt employees' bonuses based on hours worked and hourly non-exempt general managers'
24 bonuses based on store performance, for example, when calculating Plaintiff's and other current
25 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of pay for the
26 purpose of paying meal period premium wages.

27 28. Defendants' foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff
28 and/or other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not

1 receiving wages to compensate them for workdays during which Defendants did not provide them
2 with meal periods in compliance with California law.

3 29. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
4 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant rest periods:** Plaintiff and other
5 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked
6 shifts of more than three-and-a-half (3.5) hours.

7 30. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
8 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor
9 Code § 226.7; Wage Order 7 at § 12. Under California law, “[e]mployees are entitled to 10
10 minutes’ rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more
11 than six hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so
12 on.” *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code
13 § 226.7; Wage Order 7 at § 12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each
14 work period. Wage Order 7 at § 12. Additionally, the rest period requirement “obligates employers
15 to permit – and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM Security*
16 *Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve
17 employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

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

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

26 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
27 hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks due to Plaintiff and other
28 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees being subjected to

missed and/or late due to chronic understaffing.

(b) failure to include hourly non-exempt employees' bonuses based on hours worked and hourly non-exempt general managers' bonuses based on store performance in the regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating and paying meal break premium wages;

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

34. Finally, on occasions when Defendants did pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a "premium" wage for late, missed, short, on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted rest periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as hourly non-exempt employees' bonuses based on hours worked and hourly non-exempt general managers' bonuses based on store performance, 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 rest period premiums.

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

36. **Failure to timely pay earned wages during employment:** In California, wages must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code § 204(a). Wages earned between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 16th and the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of

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

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

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

21 39. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section
22 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an
23 employee his or her wages, the employer must "furnish each of his or her employees ... an
24 itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the
25 employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is
26 exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of
27 the Industrial Welfare Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable
28 piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all

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

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

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

17 42. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, because Defendants failed to pay
18 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
19 all of their earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium
20 wages, and/or rest period premium wages), Defendants failed to pay those employees timely after
21 each employee’s termination and/or resignation, in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and
22 203.

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

27 44. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor
28 Code section 2699.3. On May 17, 2024, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and
provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of

1 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
2 violations alleged.

3 45. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by
4 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code
5 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the
6 parties notice within 65 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends
7 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

8 46. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
9 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a),
10 226.7, 510, 512, and 1194, During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present,
11 preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the
12 following amounts:

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

17 b. For violations of Labor Code section 226(a), alternatively, two hundred
18 fifty dollars (\$250) for each employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and one
19 thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each subsequent violation, for each underpaid employee for each pay
20 period [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 226.3].

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

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

1 section 210].

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

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

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 **WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF/HERSELF AND ON OTHER**
11 **AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:**

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

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

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

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

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

22
23 Dated: July 25, 2024

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

24
25
26 By:



Joseph Lavi, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Jeffrey M. Schwartz, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff VANNO PLONG,
on behalf of himself and current and former
aggrieved employees