BOKHOUR LAW GROUP, P.C.
Mehrdad Bokhour, Esq., CA Bar No. 285256
mehrdad@bokhourlaw.com
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 520
Los Angeles, California 90067
Tel: (310) 975-1493; Fax: (310) 675-0861

FALAKASSA LAW, P.C.
Joshua S. Falakassa, CA Bar No. 295045
josh@falakassalaw.com
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 520
Los Angeles, California 90067
Tel: (818) 456-6168; Fax: (888) 505-0868

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Classes

Electronically Filed by Superior Court of CA, County of Santa Clara, on 11/12/2026 3:13 PM Reviewed By: Y. Chavez Env. #25879939 - Case #25CV464122

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

JOSE FERNANDEZ, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

MOLINA INSURANCE AGENCY, INC., a California Corporation; and DOES 1-50, inclusive.

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 25CV464122

FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND PAGA ACTION COMPLAINT:

(1) FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME WAGES;
(2) FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM, STRAIGHT-TIME, AND CONTRACT WAGES;
(3) MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS;
(4) REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS;
(5) FAILURE TO PAY ALL SICK TIME;
(6) WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS;
(7) WAITING TIME PENALTIES;
(8) UNFAIR COMPETITION; &
(9) PENALTIES UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT ("PAGA")

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff Jose Fernandez ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated non-exempt employees, alleges and complains of Defendant Molina Insurance Agency, Inc., *dba* Fiesta Auto Insurance ("Defendant") and DOES 1 to 50 (collectively "Defendants") and each of them, as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Defendant is an insurance provider offering a range of insurance products to meet the needs of individuals and businesses.

2. Plaintiff brings this class action lawsuit against Defendant for alleged violations of the California Labor Code and Business and Professions Code.

3. As set forth below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to pay all overtime compensation and sick pay wages due to its failure to correctly calculate the "regular rate of pay." Moreover, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant's meal and rest period policies and practices failed to allow and permit non-exempt employees to take all compliant and timely meal and rest periods or pay premium wages at the "regular rate of pay" in lieu thereof. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant failed to provide non-exempt employees with accurate written itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226(a) and failed to timely pay all final wages upon separation of employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203.

4. Plaintiff also brings a claim for civil penalties based on the foregoing Labor Code violations under the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA").

5. Based on these alleged Labor Code violations, Plaintiff now brings this class action and representative action to recover unpaid wages, restitution, penalties, and other related relief for himself and all other similarly situated non-exempt employees.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated employees hereby brings this class action for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under California Labor Code §§ 201-203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226(a)(6), 226(e), 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2698 et seq., and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders ("Wage Orders"), in addition to seeking declaratory relief and restitution pursuant to

California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq*.

7. This class action is brought pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

8. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant's violations of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders because the amount in controversy exceeds this Court's jurisdictional minimum.

9. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 395(a) and 395.5, Defendant operates in California within the County of Santa Clara, and Defendant is within the jurisdiction of this Court for the service of process.

PARTIES

10. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff, who is over 18, was and currently is a California resident residing in the State of California.

11. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and alleges that Defendants are authorized to do business within the County of Santa Clara and is and/or was the legal employer of Plaintiff and the Class Members during the applicable statutory periods. Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants' policies and/or practices complained of herein and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed to him by California Labor Code §§ 201-203, 204, 210, 226, 226(a), 226(e), 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 516, 1174, 1174.5, 1199, and the California Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq*., and applicable Wage Orders.

12. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the four years preceding the filing of the Complaint and continuing to the present, Defendants did (and continue to do) business in the State of California, County of Santa Clara.

13. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or corporate, of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 50, inclusive, and for that reason, said Defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious Defendants, whether individual, partners, or corporate, were responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein and proximately caused Plaintiff and the Classes to be subject to the unlawful employment practices alleged herein.

14. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, Defendants were and are the employers of Plaintiff and all members of the Classes. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants. Furthermore, the Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each and every one of the other Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned, were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment. Defendants, and each of them, approved of, condoned, and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts or omissions complained of herein.

15. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of and engaged in a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise and acting within the course and scope of and in pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise. Further, Plaintiff alleges that all Defendants were joint employers for all purposes of Plaintiff and all members of the Class.

COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

16. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as a non-exempt " Mascot" from 2015 to April 2024. Based in San Jose, California, he performed essential duties integral to the Defendant's operations.

17. Alongside Plaintiff, other non-exempt employees, including but not limited to Customer Service Representative, Mascot, Insurance Agent, Tax Professional, Sales Representative, and Sign Holder—played a critical role in supporting Defendant's daily operations and overall success across California.

18. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were responsible for a wide range of tasks critical to the company's operations, such as sales, tax services, customer service, and overall insurance provider duties. Their work ensured the effective operation of Defendant's assets. Despite the essential nature of their contributions, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees allege that Defendant failed to comply with California labor laws, including but not limited to accurate timekeeping, proper wage payment, and provision of meal and rest periods, as set forth below.

19. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees regularly worked

various shifts, many of which were more than 8.0 hours in a workday and 40.0 hours in a workweek. Plaintiff alleges that other non-exempt employees were also subjected to the same policies, procedures, practices, working conditions, and corresponding wage and hour violations to which he was subjected during his employment.

20. First, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees worked regular shifts that lasted longer than 8.0 hours in a workday and resulted in non-exempt employees regularly working more than 40 hours in a workweek. However, Defendant uniformly failed to properly calculate and pay overtime wages at the proper legal rate due to Defendant's failure to include all forms of compensation/remuneration, including, but not limited to, stipends, shift pay, non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, incentives, and all other forms of remuneration in calculating the "regular rate of pay" for purposes of overtime compensation.

21. Under the California Labor Code (as well as the FLSA), courts have consistently held that regularly paid non-discretionary bonuses (and other forms of pay) must be included in determining an employee's "regular rate of pay" for purposes of calculating overtime. (See *Haber v. The Americana Corp.* 378 F. 2d 854, 855-856 (9th Cir. 1967) [holding that regularly paid efficiency bonuses must be included in calculating the "regular rate"]; *Wang v. Chinese Daily News*, Inc. 435 F. Supp. 2d 1042, 1055-1057 (C.D. Cal. 2006) [granting summary judgment to Plaintiff under California and federal law on the grounds that Defendant improperly calculated overtime by excluding annual bonuses paid to employees from the "regular rate of compensation"]; see *Walling v. Youngerman-Reynolds Hardwood Co*. (1945) 65 S.Ct. 1242, 1245. ("The regular rate by its very nature must reflect all payments which the parties have agreed shall be received regularly during the workweek, exclusive of overtime payments. It is not an arbitrary label chosen by the parties but an actual fact. Once the parties have decided upon the amount of wages and the mode of payment, the determination of the regular rate becomes a matter of mathematical computation, the result of which is unaffected by any designation of a contrary 'regular rate' in the contracts."); see also 29 CFR §§ 778.110 ("production bonus") and 778.111 ("piece-rate").

22. Labor Code § 510 requires an employer to compensate an employee who works more than eight (8.0) hours in one workday, forty (40.0) hours in a workweek, and for the first eight (8.0)

hours worked on the seventh consecutive day, no less than one and one-half times (11/2) the regular rate of pay. In addition, Labor Code § 510 obligates employers to compensate employees at no less than twice the regular rate of pay when an employee works more than twelve (12.0) hours in a workday or more than eight (8.0) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work. Pursuant to Section 3 of the applicable Wage Orders, non-exempt employees shall not be employed more than eight (8.0) hours in any workday or more than 40.0 hours in any workweek unless the employee receives one and one-half (11/2) times such employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours in the workweek.

23. By their policy of requiring Plaintiff and the other non-exempt employees to work in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or forty (40) hours in a workweek without compensating them at the lawful rate of one-half (1 1/2) their "regular rate of pay," Defendant willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code § 510 and the applicable Wage Orders.

24. Similarly, at all relevant times, Defendant also failed in its obligation to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees the legally required paid sick days at the legal rate pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246(a),(b), which requires that "[a]n employee who, on or after July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days. . . at the rate of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked, beginning at the commencement of employment." Labor Code § 246(l)(1) provides that paid sick time for non-exempt employees must be "calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek."

25. Additionally, Labor Code § 246(l)(2) states that the paid sick time must be "calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment." Finally, Labor Code §246(i) requires employers to "provide an employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either the employee's itemized wage statement described in Section 226 or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee's payment of wages."

26. Here, at all relevant times, Defendant failed in its obligation to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees the legally required paid sick days at the legal rate, including all forms of compensation, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246(a), (b). As such, Defendant paid sick time below the "regular rate of pay" as required by Labor Code §§ 246(l) (1-2).

27. Moreover, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were denied compliant and timely 30-minute off-duty meal periods as mandated by California law. Due to Defendant's uniform meal period policies/practices, operational requirements, and work demands, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees often could not take timely and uninterrupted net 30-minute first meal periods before the end of the fifth hour of work. Further, when Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees worked more than 10.0 hours in a shift, they were not always allowed to take a mandated second meal period before the end of the tenth hour of work, in violation of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders. Indeed, Plaintiff's and other non-exempt employees' meal periods were often interrupted and/or lasted fewer than 30 minutes due to Defendant's meal period policies/procedures, operational requirements, and work demands.

28. In addition, for each missed or non-compliant meal period, Defendant failed and continues to fail to maintain a mechanism by which non-exempt employees were paid meal period premiums at the "regular rate of pay" pursuant to *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) and Labor Code § 226.7.

29. Accordingly, due to Defendant's uniform meal period practices, non-exempt employees were also regularly denied legally compliant meal periods in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 510, 516, and applicable Wage Orders.

30. Next, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not provided with all 10-minute rest periods for every four hours worked, or a major fraction thereof, due to Defendant's uniform rest period policies/practices, operational requirements, and work demands. As a result, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were and are often unable to take a net 10-minute duty-free rest period for every major fraction of four hours worked. This includes a second rest period for shifts in excess of six hours and a third rest period for shifts in excess of 10.0 hours in a workday.

31. By not relieving all non-exempt employees of all duties during rest periods, Defendant failed to provide legally compliant rest periods. See *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc*. (2016) 2 Cal. 5th 257, 269 [concluding that "during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time."] (Emphasis added). In *Augustus*, the California Supreme Court expressly rejected the employer's assertion that it could provide an on-duty rest period to employees who worked as security guards and further explained: "that employers [must] relinquish any control over how employees spend their break time and relieve their employees of all duties." *Id*. at 273. Each time non-exempt employees could not take a compliant rest period, Defendant failed, and continues to fail, to pay rest-period premium pay at the "regular rate of pay," as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

32. Accordingly, due to Defendant's uniform rest period policies/practices and work demands, non-exempt employees were regularly denied legally compliant rest breaks in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and applicable Wage Orders.

33. As a result of Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for all hours they were subject to the control of Defendant, including all overtime wages, sick pay wages, Defendant's failure to adequately pay for all overtime/sick pay wages at the appropriate legal rate, and Defendant's failure to pay all meal and rest period premiums at the "regular rate of pay," Defendant issued wage statements which failed to identify the gross wages earned accurately, the total hours worked, the net wages earned, and the correct corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1, 2, 5, and 9).

34. Labor Code § 226.3 provides that "[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a) of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars ($250) per employee per violation in an initial violation and one thousand dollars ($1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage deduction statement or fails to keep the required in subdivision (a) of Section 226."

35. Thus, for the violations of Labor Code section 226 described above, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees may also recover Labor Code § 226.3 penalties for Defendant's violations of Labor Code § 226(a). Consequently, because Defendant failed to comply with Labor Code § 226(a),

Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees would be entitled to recover penalties under Labor Code § 226(e).

36. Finally, because Defendant failed to pay all overtime wages, sick pay wages, and meal and rest period premiums at the "regular rate of pay," Defendant also failed and continues to fail to pay Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees all wages owed at their time of separation from employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203. Thus, non-exempt employees would be entitled to recover waiting time penalties under Labor Code §§ 201-203.

37. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees all minimum, straight-time, and contract wages owed for all hours worked, in violation of Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 and the applicable Wage Orders, entitling the affected employees to the unpaid wages, interest, and liquidated damages under Labor Code § 1194.2.

38. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant failed to pay all wages owed within the time limits set by Labor Code § 204, subjecting Defendant to penalties under Labor Code § 210, and failed to keep accurate records as required by Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

39. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the following Classes pursuant to § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure:

> All current or former non-exempt hourly employees who work or worked for Defendant in California during the four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint through the date of trial. (the "Class");
>
> All current or former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in California and worked overtime hours during at least one shift during the four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint through the date of trial. ("the Overtime Subclass");
>
> All current or former employees who work or worked for Defendant in California during the one year immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint through the date of trial. ("the Wage Statement Subclass")
>
> All employees who work or worked for Defendant in California and who left their employment during the three years immediately preceding the filing of

the Complaint through the date of trial. ("Waiting Time Penalty Subclass")

(collectively "the Classes")

40. **Numerosity/Ascertainability**: The members of the Classes are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and not practicable. The membership of the Classes is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, it is estimated that the Classes consist of at least one hundred (100) individuals. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendant's employment and payroll records.

41. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well-Defined Community of Interest**: There are common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and all other similarly situated non-exempt employees, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members including, without limitation:

1. Whether Defendant failed to properly calculate the "regular rate of pay" for purposes of paying overtime and sick pay wages to the members of the Class;

2. Whether Defendant provided legally compliant meal and rest periods or proper compensation at the "regular rate of pay" in lieu thereof to members of the Class;

3. Whether Defendant furnished legally compliant wage statements to members of the Wage Statement Subclass pursuant to Labor Code § 226(a); and

4. Whether the timing and amount of payment of final wages to members of the Waiting Time Penalty Subclass at the time of separation from employment were unlawful.

42. **Predominance of Common Questions**: Common questions of law and fact predominate over questions that affect only individual members of the Classes. The common questions of law set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendant's policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member, such as without limitation, Defendant's failure to properly pay overtime and sick pay wages, Defendant's failure to provide all compliant meal and rest periods or premiums at the "regular rate of pay" in lieu thereof, Defendant's failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and Defendant's failure to pay for all wages due upon separation of employment. As such, the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each class member's showing as to his or her eligibility for recovery or the amount of his

or her damages.

43. **Typicality**: The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Classes because Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as a non-exempt employee in California during the statute(s) of limitation applicable to each cause of action pled in the Complaint in this action. As alleged herein, Plaintiff, like the members of the Classes, was deprived of overtime and sick pay wages, was deprived of meal and rest period premium wages, was subject to Defendant's uniform meal and rest period policies/practices, was not provided accurate itemized wage statements, and was not timely paid all wages owed upon separation of employment.

44. **Adequacy of Representation**: Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary steps to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the members of the Classes. Moreover, Plaintiff's attorneys are ready, willing, and able to fully and adequately represent the members of the Classes. Plaintiff's attorneys have prosecuted and are actively litigating several wage-and-hour class actions in state and federal courts and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the members of the Classes.

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

46. Moreover, requiring each member of the Classes to pursue an individual remedy would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file an action against their former and/or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent damages to their careers at subsequent employment. Further, the prosecution of separate actions by

the individual class members, even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications with respect to the individual class members against Defendant herein and which would establish potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant; and/or legal determinations with respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interest of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which would substantially impair or impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. Further, the claims of the individual members of the class are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual prosecution considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending thereto. As such, the Classes identified above are maintainable as Classes under § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME WAGES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

47. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all previous paragraphs by reference.

48. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to overtime wages for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

49. At all times relevant herein, Defendant was required to properly pay Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Subclass for all overtime hours worked pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194 and the applicable Wage Orders.

50. Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order requires an employer to pay an employee "one and one-half (1½) times the employee's regular rate of pay" for work in excess of 8 hours per workday and/or in excess of 40 hours of work in the workweek. The same section also requires an employer to pay an employee double the employee's regular rate of pay for work in excess of twelve hours each workday and/or for work in excess of 8 hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in the workweek. Defendant caused Plaintiff to work overtime and hours but did not compensate Plaintiff or members of the Overtime Subclass at one and one-half times their "regular rate of pay" for such hours.

51. At all relevant times herein, Defendant failed to conform its pay practices to the requirements of the law. This unlawful conduct includes but is not limited to, Defendant's failure to include all forms of compensation, including, but not limited to, stipends, shift pay, non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, and incentive pay, in calculating the "regular rate of pay," which resulted in these individuals not being paid for all overtime hours worked.

52. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and the members of the Overtime Subclass in a civil action for the unpaid amount of overtime wages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 1194, and 1198, the applicable Wage Orders, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM, STRAIGHT-TIME, AND CONTRACT WAGES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

53. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all previous paragraphs by reference.

54. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1197.1, which entitle non-exempt employees to payment of no less than the minimum wage for all hours worked, to payment of all straight-time and contract wages earned, to liquidated damages for unpaid minimum wages, and to timely payment of all wages within the periods prescribed by law.

55. At all relevant times, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and members of the Class all minimum, straight-time, and contract wages owed for all hours worked, and failed to pay all wages within the time required by Labor Code § 204, as set forth in the Common Factual Allegations of this Complaint.

56. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and the members of the Class in a civil action for all unpaid minimum, straight-time, and contract wages, liquidated damages, interest, statutory penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1197.1, the applicable Wage Orders, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

57. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all previous paragraphs by reference.

58. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant failed in its affirmative obligation to provide all of its hourly non-exempt employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Class, with all required meal periods in accordance with the mandates of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders, for the reasons set forth in the Common Allegations section of this Complaint.

59. Despite Defendant's violations, Defendant has not paid an additional hour of pay at the "regular rate of pay" to Plaintiff and Class members at their respective regular rates of pay for each violation, per California Labor Code § 226.7.

60. As a result, Defendant is responsible for paying premium compensation at the "regular rate of pay" for meal period violations, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit pursuant to the applicable Wage Orders, Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and Civil Code §§ 3287(b) and 3289.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

61. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all previous paragraphs by reference.

62. Section 12 of the applicable Wage Orders and Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516 establish the right of non-exempt employees to be provided with a rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour period worked or major fraction thereof.

63. Due to its unlawful rest period policy/practices and operational requirements/work demands, Defendant did not authorize and permit Plaintiff and Class members to take all rest periods to which they were legally entitled.

64. Despite Defendant's violations, Defendant has not paid an additional hour of pay at the "regular rate of pay" to Plaintiff and Class members at their respective regular rates of pay for

each violation, per California Labor Code § 226.7.

65. The foregoing violations create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and members of the Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of rest period premiums owing, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit pursuant to the applicable Wage Orders, Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516, and Civil Code §§ 3287(b) and 3289.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY ALL SICK TIME

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

66. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all previous paragraphs by reference.

67. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, and 1199 which provide that "[a]n employee who, on or after July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days. . . at the rate of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked, beginning at the commencement of employment."

68. At all times relevant herein, Defendant was required to properly pay Plaintiff and Class members for all sick time pursuant to California Labor Code § 246 and the applicable Wage Orders.

69. Labor Code § 246(l)(1) provides that paid sick time for non-exempt employees must be "calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek." Additionally, Labor Code § 246(l)(2) states that the paid sick time must be "calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment." Finally, Labor Code §246(i) requires employers to "provide an employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either the employee's itemized wage statement described in Section 226 or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee's payment of wages."

70. Defendant failed in its obligation to provide Plaintiff and the Class the legally required paid sick days at the legal rate pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246(a), (b). Plaintiff and the Class members

were not paid at the correct "regular rate of pay."

71. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and the members of the Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of wages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 246, 1192, 1194 *et seq*., 1197, 1198, the applicable Wage Orders, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

72. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all previous paragraphs by reference.

73. Labor Code 226(a) states in pertinent part the following:

> "(a) An employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, shall furnish to his or her employee, either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (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 period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a 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."

74. As set forth above, during the Class Period, Defendant issued and continues to issue wage statements to its employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Subclass, which are inadequate under Labor Code Section § 226(a).

75. Because Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Subclass for all overtime, sick pay wages, and missed meal and rest period premiums at the appropriate "regular rate of pay," Defendant failed to include required information on Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Subclass' wage statements, including, but not limited to, the total hours worked and the correct corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate in violation of Labor Code section

226(a)(1,2,5 and 9).

76. Defendant's failure to comply with section 226(a) of the Labor Code was knowing and intentional.

77. As a result of Defendant's issuance of inaccurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Subclass in violation of section 226(a) of the California Labor Code, Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Subclass are each entitled to recover an initial penalty of $50, and subsequent penalties of $100, up to an amount not exceeding an aggregate penalty of $4,000 per Plaintiff and per every member of the Wage Statement Subclass from Defendant's pursuant to section 226(e) of the Labor Code, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

WAITING TIME PENALTIES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

78. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all previous paragraphs by reference.

79. The actionable period for this cause of action is three years before the filing of this Complaint through the present and ongoing until the violation is corrected, or the class is certified.

80. Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 require Defendant to pay all compensation due and owing to Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Subclass during the actionable period for this cause of action at or around the time their employment is terminated or ended.

81. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay compensation promptly upon discharge or resignation, as required by Labor Code sections 201 and 202, the employer is liable for penalties for continued compensation up to thirty (30) workdays.

82. Defendant willfully failed to pay the Waiting Time Subclass for all hours worked, including all overtime, sick pay wages, and their meal and rest period premiums at the "regular rate of pay" before or upon termination or separation from employment with Defendant as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

83. As a result, Defendant is liable to the Waiting Time Subclass for waiting time penalties amounting to thirty (30) days wages for Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Subclass pursuant to Labor Code § 203. *See,* e.g., DLSE Manual, 4.3.4 (Failure to pay any sort of wages due upon termination

entitles an employee to recover waiting time penalties).

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR COMPETITION

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

84. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

85. Defendant has engaged and continues to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business practices in California in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq*., by failing to pay all overtime and sick pay wages at the proper legal rate, by failing to provide all legally required meal and rest periods or pay premium payments at the "regular rate of pay" in lieu thereof, by failing to provide accurate wage statements, and by failing to pay all earned wages at the time of separation from employment.

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

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

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

89. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to protect his interests and those of the Classes, to obtain restitution and injunctive relief on behalf of Defendant's current hourly non-exempt employees, and to enforce important rights affecting the public interest. Plaintiff has thereby incurred the financial burden of attorneys' fees and costs, which he is entitled to recover under Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

90. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

91. Defendant has committed several Labor Code violations against Plaintiff and other similarly aggrieved employees. Plaintiff, an "aggrieved employee" within the meaning of Labor Code § 2698 *et seq*., acting on behalf of himself and other similarly aggrieved employees, brings this PAGA representative action against Defendant to recover the civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other similarly aggrieved employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 (a) and (f) including, but not limited to (1) $100 for each initial violation and (2) $200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided based on the following Labor Code violations:

a) Failing to pay Plaintiff and other similarly Aggrieved Employees all overtime and sick pay wages at the appropriate premium rates in violation of Labor Code §§ 246, 510, 1194, 1197;

b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other similarly Aggrieved Employees with all of their statutorily mandated meal periods in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;

c) Failing to authorize and permit Plaintiff and other similarly Aggrieved employees with all of their statutorily mandated rest periods in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;

d) Failing to furnish Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable Wage Orders;

e) Failing to pay final wages in a timely manner in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203 and applicable Wage Orders;

f) Failing to pay Plaintiff and other similarly Aggrieved Employees all minimum, straight-time, and contract wages owed and failing to timely pay all wages in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 1194, 1197, and 1197.1; and

g) Failing to keep accurate records in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5.

92. On April 21, 2025, Plaintiff submitted written notice to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") through the LWDA's online filing system, designated

Case No. LWDA-CM-1093656-25, and gave notice to Defendant Molina Insurance Agency, Inc., *dba* Fiesta Auto Insurance ("Defendant"), of Defendant's violations of the California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq*., with respect to violations of the California Labor Code identified in the preceding paragraph. More than sixty-five days have passed since submission of the PAGA notice, and Plaintiff has exhausted the administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act with respect to these violations.

93. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to protect his interests and the interests of similarly aggrieved employees, and to assess and collect the civil penalties owed by Defendant. Plaintiff has hereby incurred attorneys' fees and costs, which he is entitled to receive under California Labor Code § 2699.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for himself and all others on whose behalf this suit is brought against Defendant, 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 Plaintiff's counsel as counsel for the Classes;

4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for unpaid overtime wages, interest, statutory relief, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 210, 510, 1194, and 1198 and the applicable Wage Orders;

5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for all unpaid minimum, straight-time, contract, and other wages, liquidated damages, interest, statutory penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1197.1 and the applicable Wage Orders;

6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for unpaid meal-period premium wages, interest, and all other available relief pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and the applicable Wage Orders;

7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for unpaid rest-period premium wages, interest, and all other available relief pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.7 and 516 and the applicable Wage

Orders;

8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for unpaid sick-pay wages, interest, statutory relief, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs pursuant to Labor Code section 246 and other applicable provisions of the Labor Code;

9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, for statutory damages, penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections 226(e) and 226.3;

10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for waiting-time penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 201 through 203;

11. Upon the Eighth Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiff and the members of the Classes of all money or property unlawfully acquired or withheld by Defendant, injunctive relief as appropriate, and all other available relief pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17200 et seq.;

12. Upon the Ninth Cause of Action, for civil penalties, injunctive relief, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs pursuant to Labor Code section 2698 et seq., including section 2699(a), (f), and (k), in the amounts permitted by law and according to proof;

13. For prejudgment and postjudgment interest as permitted by Labor Code section 218.6, Civil Code sections 3287 and 3289, and other applicable law;

14. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as authorized by Labor Code sections 218.5, 226, 1194, and 2699, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, and other applicable law; and

15. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: November 9, 2026

FALAKASSA LAW, P.C.
BOKHOUR LAW GROUP, P.C.

By: _____

Joshua Falakassa, Esq.
Mehrdad Bokhour, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Classes

PROOF OF SERVICE

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 eighteen years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 520, Los Angeles, California 90067.

On November 12, 2026, I served the following document(s) described as **FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND PAGA ACTION COMPLAINT** on the interested parties as follows:

Christopher J. Keller, Esq.
ckeller@sfemploymentlawyers.net
SF EMPLOYMENT LAWYERS, PC
447 Sutter Street, Suite 405
San Francisco, California 94108

Attorneys for Defendant Molina Insurance Agency, Inc.

BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE: I transmitted the above-referenced document(s) via electronic service provider First Legal to the person(s) identified above at the email address(es) indicated and did not, within a reasonable time after transmission, receive any message or communication indicating that delivery failed or that any other error had occurred which would delay or caused failure in transmission and delivery of the document and/or any attachments thereto.

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

Executed on November 12, 2026, in Los Angeles, California.

/s/ Cynthia Garcia
Cynthia Garcia