

HAINES LAW GROUP, APC
Paul K. Haines (SBN 248226)
phaines@haineslawgroup.com
Sean M. Blakely (SBN 264384)
sblakely@haineslawgroup.com
Liam A. Hall (SBN 358204)
lhall@haineslawgroup.com
2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180
El Segundo, California 90245
Tel: (424) 292-2350
Fax: (424) 292-2355

Attorneys for Plaintiff

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
06/26/2025
David W. Stoyan, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
By: M. Arellanes Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

MARIA SANTANA, as an individual and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ROYAL TERRACE HEALTHCARE, LLC; a
California Limited Liability Company; and
DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 25STCV11475

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

- (1) **FAILURE TO PAY ALL
OVERTIME WAGES (LABOR
CODE §§ 204, 510, 1194 and 1198);**
- (2) **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 1182.12, 1194,
1194.2, 1197);**
- (3) **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512, and
558);**
- (4) **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 516, and
558);**
- (5) **WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE § 226 *et seq.*);**
- (6) **UNFAIR COMPETITION (BUS &
PROF CODE § 17200 *et seq.*); &**
- (7) **CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT (LABOR CODE §
2698 *et seq.*).**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE**

1 Plaintiff Maria Santana (“Plaintiff”) hereby brings this First Amended Class and
2 Representative Action Complaint (“Complaint”) against Defendants Royal Terrace Healthcare,
3 LLC, a California limited liability company and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive (collectively,
4 “Defendants”), and on information and belief alleges as follows:

5 **JURISDICTION**

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 Labor Code §§ 204, 226 *et seq.*,
8 226.7, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, and 2698 *et seq.*, California
9 Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order
10 No. 5 (“Wage Order 5”), in addition to seeking declaratory relief and restitution. This Complaint
11 is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. This Court has jurisdiction over
12 Defendants’ violations of the California Labor Code because the amount in controversy exceeds
13 this Court's jurisdictional minimum.

14 **VENUE**

15 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to California Code of Civil
16 Procedure §§ 395(a) and 395.5, as at least some of the acts and omissions complained of herein
17 occurred in Los Angeles County. Defendants own, maintain offices, transact business, have an
18 agent or agents within Los Angeles County, and/or otherwise are found within Los Angeles
19 County, and Defendants are within the jurisdiction of this Court for purposes of service of process.

20 **PARTIES**

21 3. Plaintiff is an individual over the age of eighteen (18). At all relevant times herein,
22 Plaintiff was, and currently is, a California resident. Within the statute of limitations periods
23 applicable to each cause of action pled herein, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-
24 exempt employee. Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants’ policies and/or practices
25 complained of herein, lost money and/or property, and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed
26 to her by Labor Code §§ 204, 226 *et seq.*, 226.7, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197,
27 1198, and 2698 *et seq.*, Business and Professions Code Section 17200 *et seq.*, and Wage Order 5,
28 which sets employment standards for the public housekeeping industry.

1 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the time
2 period relevant to this action, Defendants did (and do) business by operating and managing long-
3 term care facilities which provide healthcare services to the elderly.

4 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
5 mentioned herein, Defendants were licensed to do business in California and were the employers
6 of Plaintiff and of the members of the Classes (as defined in Paragraph 14).

7 6. Plaintiff does not know the true names, capacities, relationships, and/or the extent
8 of participation of Defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, in the conduct alleged in this
9 Complaint. For that reason, Defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are sued under such
10 fictitious names. Plaintiff prays for leave to amend this Complaint when their true names and
11 capacities are known. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each
12 fictitiously named Respondent is and was responsible in some way for the alleged wage-and-hour
13 violations and other wrongful conduct that subjected Plaintiff and the Classes, as defined below,
14 to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein. All references in
15 this Complaint to “Defendants” shall be deemed to include all DOE Defendants.

16 7. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing
17 of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants; and furthermore, the
18 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each and every one of
19 the other Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned
20 were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment. Defendants, and each
21 of them, approved of, condoned, and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts or
22 omissions complained of herein.

23 8. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of
24 and engaged in a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acted within the course
25 and scope of and in pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise. Further,
26 Plaintiff alleges that all Defendants were joint employers for all purposes of Plaintiff and the
27 Classes (as defined in Paragraph 14).

28 ///

GENERAL FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

9. Defendants have employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt Certified Nursing Assistant (“CNA”) (or similarly titled position) since approximately September 2024. Defendants operate and manage long-term care facilities which provide healthcare services to the elderly.

10. During Plaintiff’s employment with Defendants, Defendants utilized a timekeeping system which resulted in Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees not being compensated for all hours actually worked, whether by rounding, time-shaving, or otherwise. Defendants have failed to pay Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for all hours worked, including (but not limited to) by requiring and/or permitting employees to work while off-the-clock, including during their off-duty meal and rest periods. Additionally, as a result of the time clock machine at the building’s entrance being inoperable, Plaintiff was required to walk a further two minutes to clock in for work at a second time clock machine. Furthermore, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were required to complete daily administrative tasks after they clocked out. This has resulted in Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees not being paid all required wages for all hours worked, including all minimum wages and overtime wages. Due to Defendants’ timekeeping policies/practices that fail to compensate for all hours worked, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not compensated for all required minimum and overtime wages.

11. During Plaintiff’s employment with Defendants, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with all legally compliant meal periods due to Defendants’ meal period policies/practices, which have frequently resulted in late (commencing after the fifth hour of work) and/or short (less than 30 minutes). Specifically, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were frequently interrupted and required to respond to emergent work issues during their meal periods. On those occasions when Plaintiff was not provided with all legally-compliant meal periods to which she was entitled, Defendants did not compensate Plaintiff with the required meal period premium(s) for each workday there was a meal period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7.

12. Defendants have also failed to authorize and permit all required rest periods for

1 Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees. Defendants have often failed to authorize and permit
2 a 10-minute rest period for every four hours worked or major fraction thereof due to work
3 demands imposed by Defendants. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees would frequently
4 skip their entire rest period because there were no colleagues available to cover their work duties.
5 Moreover, if Plaintiff's rest period was not skipped, it was often interrupted as Plaintiff was
6 expected to respond to emergent issues during her rest period. On those occasions when Plaintiff
7 was not authorized and permitted all legally required rest periods to which she was entitled,
8 Defendants did not compensate Plaintiff with the required rest period premium for each workday
9 in which she experienced a rest period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7.

10 13. As a result of Defendants' failure to compensate Plaintiff and other non-exempt
11 employees for all minimum wages, overtime wages, and all meal and rest period premium wages,
12 Defendants maintained inaccurate payroll records and failed to issue accurate, compliant,
13 itemized wage statements.

14 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

15 14. Class Definitions: Plaintiff brings this Complaint on behalf of herself and the
16 following Classes pursuant to Section 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure:

17 a. The Overtime Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-exempt
18 employees in California who worked more than 8.0 hours per day and/or 40.0
19 hours per week and were subject to Defendants' timekeeping policies and/or
20 practices, during the time period from July 20, 2024 through the present.

21 b. The Minimum Wage Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-
22 exempt employees in California who were subject to Defendants' timekeeping
23 policies and/or practices, during the time period from July 20, 2024 through the
24 present.

25 c. The Meal Period Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-
26 exempt employees in California who worked at least one shift in excess of 5.0
27 hours, during the time period from July 20, 2024 through the present.

28 d. The Rest Period Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-

exempt employees in California who worked at least one shift of 3.5 hours or more, during the time period from July 20, 2024 through the present.

- e. The Wage Statement Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants, during the time period from July 20, 2024 through the present.

15. **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 and subclasses are unknown to Plaintiff, at this time; however, it is estimated that the Class numbers are in excess of one hundred (100) individuals as to each class. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants' employment records.

16. **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 employees, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members including, without limitation, to:

- i. Whether Defendants violated the applicable Labor Code provisions, including, but not limited to, §§ 510 and 1194 by requiring members of the Overtime Class to perform overtime work and not paying for said work in accordance with the overtime laws of the State of California;
- ii. Whether Defendants paid all minimum wages owed to members of the Minimum Wage Class for all hours worked pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2 and 1197;
- iii. Whether Defendants' timekeeping policies/practices resulted in the failure to properly compensate members of the Overtime Class and Minimum Wage Classes;
- iv. Whether Defendants provided legally compliant meal periods to members of the Meal Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;
- v. Whether Defendants correctly paid meal period premium payments for non-compliant meal periods pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7;

- 1 vi. Whether Defendants authorized and permitted legally compliant rest periods to
2 members of the Rest Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;
3 vii. Whether Defendants correctly paid rest period premium payments for non-
4 compliant rest periods pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7; and
5 viii. Whether Defendants furnished legally compliant wage statements to members of
6 the Wage Statement Class pursuant to Labor Code § 226.

7 17. **Predominance of Common Questions:** Common questions of law and fact
8 predominate over questions that affect only individual members of the Classes. The common
9 questions of law and fact set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendants'
10 uniform policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member including, but not
11 limited to, Defendants' uniform timekeeping policies and/or practices, and meal and rest period
12 policies and/or practices. As such, the common questions predominate over individual questions
13 concerning each individual class member's showing as to his or her eligibility for recovery or as
14 to the amount of his or her damages.

15 18. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Classes because
16 Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the statutes
17 of limitation applicable to each cause of action pled in this Complaint. As alleged herein, Plaintiff,
18 like the members of the Classes, was not properly paid minimum and overtime wages due to
19 Defendants' timekeeping policies/practices, was not provided all required meal periods, was not
20 authorized and permitted to take all required rest periods, did not receive meal and rest period
21 premium wages for missed and/or non-compliant meal and rest periods, and was not issued
22 accurate itemized wage statements.

23 19. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary
24 steps to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the members of the Classes. Moreover,
25 Plaintiff's attorneys are ready, willing, and able to fully and adequately represent the members of
26 the Classes and Plaintiff. Plaintiff's attorneys have prosecuted and defended numerous wage-
27 and-hour class actions in state and federal courts in the past and are committed to vigorously
28 prosecuting this action on behalf of the members of the Classes.

20. **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, Defendants would necessarily gain an unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources. 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 Defendants herein; and which would establish potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; 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 Classes are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual prosecution considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending thereto. As such, the Classes are maintainable as classes under § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

///

///

///

///

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME WAGES**

3 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

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

5 22. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, and
6 1198, which provides that non-exempt employees are entitled to all overtime wages and
7 compensation for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure
8 to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

9 23. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly compensate
10 non-exempt employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class, for all overtime
11 hours worked pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194 and Wage Order 5. Wage Order 5, § 3
12 requires an employer to pay an employee “one and one-half (1½) times the employee’s regular
13 rate of pay” for work in excess of 8 hours per workday and/or in excess of 40 hours of work in
14 the workweek. Defendants caused Plaintiff to work overtime hours but did not compensate
15 Plaintiff or members of the Overtime Class with one and one-half times their regular rate of pay
16 for such hours.

17 24. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and create an entitlement to
18 recovery by Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount
19 of overtime premiums owing, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys’ fees, and
20 costs of suit according to California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 216, 510, 1194, and 1198; and Code
21 of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

22 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**

24 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

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

26 26. Wage Order 5, § 4 and California Labor Code §§ 1197 and 1182.12 establish the
27 right of employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state law.
28 Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal

1 minimum wage as required by Labor Code § 1197 may recover the unpaid balance together with
2 attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid
3 wages and interest accrued thereon.

4 27. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to conform their pay practices to
5 the requirements of the law by failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class
6 for all hours worked including, but not limited to, all hours they were subject to the control of
7 Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the California Labor Code and Wage
8 Order 5.

9 28. California Labor Code § 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an employee
10 under conditions that the IWC prohibits. California Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide
11 that an employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage is liable to pay
12 those employees the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages in an
13 amount equal to the wages due and interest thereon.

14 29. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged
15 herein, Plaintiff and the Minimum Wage Class have sustained economic damages including, but
16 not limited to, unpaid wages and lost interest, in an amount to be established at trial, and are
17 entitled to recover economic and statutory damages and penalties and other appropriate relief as
18 a result of Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code and Wage Order 5.

19 30. The foregoing practices and policies are unlawful and create an entitlement to
20 recovery by Plaintiff and the members of the Minimum Wage Class in a civil action for the unpaid
21 amount of minimum wages owing, including interest thereon, liquidated damages, statutory and
22 civil penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code §§ 204, 558,
23 1194, 1197, and 1198, Wage Order 5, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

24 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

26 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

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

28 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants

1 failed in their affirmative obligation to provide all of their non-exempt employees in California,
2 including Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class, with all legally compliant meal periods
3 in accordance with the mandates of the California Labor Code and Wage Order 5, § 11. Despite
4 Defendants' violations, Defendants did not pay an additional hour of pay to Plaintiff and members
5 of the Meal Period Class at their respective regular rates of pay, in accordance with California
6 Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226.7, and 512.

7 33. As a result, Defendants are responsible for paying premium compensation for meal
8 period violations pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and Wage Order 5, including interest
9 thereon, statutory penalties, civil penalties, and costs of suit.

10 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

12 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

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

14 35. Wage Order 5, § 12 and Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516 establish the right of
15 employees to be provided with a rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour
16 period worked, or major fraction thereof.

17 36. As alleged herein, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members
18 of the Rest Period Class to take all required rest periods.

19 37. The foregoing violations create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and
20 members of the Rest Period Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of rest period premiums
21 owing, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, civil penalties, and costs of suit according
22 to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and Civil Code §§ 3287(b) and 3289.

23 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS**

25 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

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

27 39. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
28 knowingly and intentionally, as a matter of uniform policy and practice, failed to furnish Plaintiff

1 and members of the Wage Statement Class with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements
2 that included, among other requirements, all hours worked, total gross wages earned, all rates of
3 pay and corresponding number of hours worked, total net wages earned, and the correct name of
4 the legal entity that is the employer in violation of Labor Code § 226 *et seq.*

5 40. Defendants' failure to furnish Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Class
6 with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements resulted in actual injury, as said failures
7 led to, among other things, the non-payment of minimum and overtime wages and meal and rest
8 period premium wages owed, and deprived them of the information necessary to identify the
9 discrepancies in Defendants' reported data.

10 41. Defendants' failures create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and members of
11 the Wage Statement Class in a civil action for all damages and/or penalties pursuant to Labor
12 Code § 226 *et seq.*, including statutory penalties, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and
13 costs of suit according to California Labor Code § 226 *et seq.*

14 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

16 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

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

18 43. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful
19 business practices in California in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, by:
20 (a) failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class all minimum wages; (b)
21 failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class all overtime wages; (c) failing to
22 provide Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class with all meal periods to which they are
23 entitled, and/or failing to pay them meal period premium payments; (d) failing to authorize and
24 permit all required duty-free rest periods to Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class, and/or
25 failing to pay them rest period premiums payments; and/or (e) knowingly failing to furnish
26 Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Class with all accurate and complete, itemized wage statements
27 in violation of Labor Code § 226.

28 44. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived

1 Plaintiff and continues to deprive members of the Classes of compensation to which they are
2 legally entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage
3 over Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers and
4 attempting to do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws.

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

9 46. The acts complained of herein occurred within the last four years immediately
10 preceding the filing of the Plaintiff's Complaint.

11 47. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this Complaint to
12 protect her interests and those of the Classes, to obtain restitution and injunctive relief on behalf
13 of Defendants' current non-exempt employees, and to enforce important rights affecting the
14 public interest. Plaintiff has thereby incurred the financial burden of attorneys' fees and costs,
15 which she is entitled to recover under Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

16 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

18 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

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

20 49. Defendants have committed several Labor Code violations against Plaintiff,
21 members of the Classes, and other aggrieved employees. Plaintiff, an "aggrieved employee"
22 within the meaning of Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*, acting on behalf of herself and other aggrieved
23 employees, brings this representative action against Defendants to recover the civil penalties due
24 to Plaintiff, the members of the Classes, other aggrieved employees, and the State of California
25 according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 558 and § 2699 (a) and (f) including, but not limited
26 to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each
27 subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code § 210 for each
28 failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each

1 initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per
2 employee per pay period; (3) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$250.00 for each subsequent
3 violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per employee per pay period; (4) \$250.00 for each
4 initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per
5 employee per pay period; and/or (5) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$200 for each
6 subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which
7 no civil penalty is specifically provided, based on the following Labor Code violations:

- 8 a. Failing to pay Plaintiff, the Overtime Class, and other aggrieved employees all
9 earned overtime compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194,
10 and 1198;
- 11 b. Failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked to Plaintiff, the Minimum
12 Wage Class, and other aggrieved employees in violation of Labor Code §§
13 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197;
- 14 c. Failing to provide all legally required meal periods, and failure to pay meal period
15 premium wages, to Plaintiff, the Meal Period Class, and other aggrieved
16 employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.2,
17 226.7, 512, 558, and 1198;
- 18 d. Failing to authorize and permit all legally required rest periods, and failure to pay
19 rest period premium wages, to Plaintiff, the Rest Period Class, and other aggrieved
20 employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7,
21 516, 558, and 1198;
- 22 e. Failing to furnish Plaintiff, the Wage Statement Class, and other aggrieved
23 employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage statements in violation of
24 Labor Code § 226;
- 25 f. Failing to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees all earned wages at least
26 twice during each calendar month in violation of Labor Code § 204; and
- 27 g. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Plaintiff and other aggrieved
28 employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1198.

50. On April 21, 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 California Labor Code and Plaintiff’s intent to bring a claim for civil penalties under California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* with respect to the violations of the California Labor Code identified in Paragraph 49 (a)-(g). Now that sixty-five days have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendants and the LWDA of these violations, and the LWDA has not provided notice that it intends to investigate the violations, Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act with respect to these violations.

51. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff seeks to represent herself and all Aggrieved Employees, as defined by Labor Code § 2699(c).

52. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to protect her interests and the interests of other aggrieved employees, and to assess and collect the civil penalties owed by Defendants. Plaintiff has thereby incurred attorneys' fees and costs, which she is entitled to receive under California Labor Code § 2699(g).

PRAAYER

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 compensatory, consequential, general and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, and 1198;
5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for payment of minimum wages, liquidated damages, and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197;
6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558;
7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and

special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558;

8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226 *et. seq.*;

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 Bus. & Prof. 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 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; and/or (5) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$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 Labor Code violations identified in Paragraph 49 (a)-(g);

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

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

///

///

///

///

///

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

2
3 Dated: June 26, 2025

Respectfully submitted,
HAINES LAW GROUP, APC

4
5 By:



Paul K. Haines
Attorneys for Plaintiff

6
7 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

8 Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial with respect to all issues triable by jury.

9
10 Dated: June 26, 2025

Respectfully submitted,
HAINES LAW GROUP, APC

11
12
13 By:



Paul K. Haines
Attorneys for Plaintiff