

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)
J. Jason Hill, Esq. (SBN 179630)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
jklein@lelawfirm.com
jhill@lelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff HOMERO SANDOVAL,
on behalf of himself and current and former aggrieved employees

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

HOMERO SANDOVAL, on behalf of himself and
current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

GOLDEN WEST SECURITY; and DOES 1 to
100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **25STCV15644**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF HOMERO
SANDOVAL'S COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff HOMERO SANDOVAL ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains
against Defendants GOLDEN WEST SECURITY; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive (collectively
"Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*
("PAGA") representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California, himself
and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-exempt

1 employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated with
2 Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all hours
3 worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure to pay
4 overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay; failure to authorize or permit all legally required
5 and/or compliant meal periods or pay meal period premium wages; failure to authorize or permit
6 all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or pay rest period premium wages; indemnification
7 for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by employees in direct consequence of discharging
8 their duties; failure to pay security guards wages on a weekly basis; statutory penalties for failure to
9 timely pay earned wages during employment; statutory penalties for failure to provide accurate wage
10 statements; statutory waiting time penalties in the form of continuation wages for failure to timely
11 pay employees all wages due upon separation of employment. Plaintiff experienced these violations
12 personally, as well as is informed and believes other aggrieved employees did as well. Plaintiff
13 seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency,
14 civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs
15 brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

16 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

17 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
18 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
19 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
20 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars
21 (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
22 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
23 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
24 California, including but not limited to Los Angeles County, at 12221 Lopez Canyon Road, Sylmar,
25 CA 91342.

26 **III. PARTIES**

27 1. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
28 Development Agency on behalf of himself and other current and former employees subject to

1 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
2 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work
3 for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
4 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently
5 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by
6 Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Los Angeles County from in or around
7 January 1, 2022, until on or about December 12, 2024.

8 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant GOLDEN
9 WEST SECURITY is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business
10 in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant hereto
11 were persons acting on behalf of Defendant GOLDEN WEST SECURITY in the establishment of,
12 or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant
13 GOLDEN WEST SECURITY operates in Los Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and
14 aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County, including but not limited to, at 12221 Lopez Canyon
15 Rd, Sylmar, CA 91342.

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

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

27 5. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100. Plaintiff
28 sues said defendants by said fictitious names, and will amend this complaint when the true names

1 and capacities are ascertained or when such facts pertaining to liability are ascertained, or as
2 permitted by law or by the Court. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously
3 named defendants is in some manner responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this
4 complaint.

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

8 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**
10 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

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

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

14 8. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges
15 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 510, 512,
16 1194, 1197, 2802, and the applicable Wage Orders.

17 9. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California
18 Labor Code:

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

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

28 12. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly

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

6 (a) Defendant automatically deducted thirty (30) minutes from Plaintiff and other
7 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees daily hours worked
8 and attributed that time to an unpaid meal break despite that Defendant routinely failed to provide
9 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
10 with meal breaks and/or duty-free meal breaks.

11 (b) failure to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
12 hourly non-exempt employees for all hours worked as a result of Defendant's timekeeping
13 application not allowing Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
14 non-exempt employees to clock in when they actually start working; only when the start of their
15 scheduled shift is despite that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
16 hourly non-exempt employees routinely start working before the start of their shift and were
17 therefore not being paid for that time.

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

24 14. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
25 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
26 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
27 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

28 15. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay**

1 **and/or failure to pay overtime wages at the proper rate of pay:** Defendants employed many of
2 their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt employees. In California, an employer
3 is required to pay hourly employees for all “hours worked,” which includes all time that an employee
4 is under control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered and permitted to work. This
5 includes the time an employee spends, either directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to
6 the benefit of the employer.’

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

10 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40) hours
11 in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in
12 any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-one-half
13 (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve (12) hours
14 in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay
15 for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a
16 workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an
17 employee.

18 Labor Code section 510.

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

22 (a) Defendant automatically deducted thirty (30) minutes from Plaintiff and other
23 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees daily hours worked
24 and attributed that time to an unpaid meal break despite that Defendant routinely failed to provide
25 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
26 with meal breaks and/or duty-free meal breaks.

27 (b) failure to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
28 hourly non-exempt employees for all hours worked as a result of Defendant’s timekeeping
application not allowing Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
non-exempt employees to clock in when they actually start working; only when the start of their
scheduled shift is despite that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based

1 hourly non-exempt employees routinely start working before the start of their shift and were
2 therefore not being paid for that time.

3 18. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
4 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
5 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
6 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

7 19. The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each
8 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
9 employees were under the control of Defendants but were not compensated. To the extent that the
10 foregoing uncompensated time occurred when Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
11 California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday,
12 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendants failed
13 to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code
14 sections 510, 1194 and 1198, and the applicable Wage Order.

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

20 21. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an
21 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of
22 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the
23 employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 4 at §11;
24 *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ
25 an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee
26 with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh
27 hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period
28 shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. A paid "on duty" meal

1 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved
2 of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

3 22. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
4 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay
5 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
6 sections 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 4 at §11.

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

11 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
12 non-exempt employees who worked single guard posts to remain on-duty during their meal periods
13 because no other guard available to relieve them of their work duties during meal breaks.

14 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
15 hourly non-exempt employees a second uninterrupted duty-free meal period of no less than thirty
16 (30) minutes for each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
17 based hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

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

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

27 26. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
28 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.

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

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

7 28. 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 Code
9 section 226.7; Wage Order 4 at §12. Under California law, “[e]mployees are entitled to 10 minutes’
10 rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six
11 hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on.” *Brinker*
12 *Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code section 226.7;
13 Wage Order 4 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each work period.
14 Wage Order 4 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement ““obligates employers to permit –
15 and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*
16 (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all
17 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

18 29. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer must
19 pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday the
20 employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7; Wage
21 Order 4 at § 12.

22 30. 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) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
27 non-exempt employees who worked single guard posts to remain on-duty during their rest periods
28 because no other guard available to relieve them of their work duties during rest breaks.

1 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
2 hourly non-exempt employees a third uninterrupted duty-free rest period of no less than ten (10) net
3 minutes on each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
4 hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

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

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

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

18 34. **Failure to Indemnify for Losses and Expenditures Incurred as Part of**
19 **Employment:** California law requires that every employer must indemnify its employees for all
20 necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in discharge of his or her duties or at the
21 obedience of the directions of the employer. Moreover, an employer is prohibited from passing the
22 ordinary business expenses and losses of the employer onto the employee. (Lab. Code, § 2802.)

23 35. Defendants have violated Labor Code Section 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiff
24 and other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees' necessary
25 expenditures they incurred in the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendants employed
26 policies, practices, and/or procedures included, but not limited to:

27 (a) requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
28 non-exempt employees to use or purchase their own tools and/or resources in order to work for

1 Defendants, including but not limited to personal cell phone usage to clock in and out for work-
2 related purposes - without reimbursing Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
3 based hourly non-exempt employees for such use.

4 36. Moreover, Defendants employed policies and procedures which ensured Plaintiff and
5 aggrieved employees would not receive indemnification for their employment related expenses.
6 This practice resulted in Plaintiff and aggrieved employees not receiving such indemnification in
7 compliance with California law.

8 37. Therefore, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for their
9 employment related expenses, including but not limited to costs related to use of their personal cell
10 phones and costs associated with their uniforms pursuant to Labor Code section 2802.

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

15 39. **Failure to wages on a weekly basis to Plaintiff and similarly situated security**
16 **guards:** Pursuant to Labor Code section 201.3(b)(1)(B), Defendants were required to pay Plaintiff
17 and similarly situated security guards no less than weekly.

18 40. Defendants, however, pursuant to their payroll policies, practices, and/or procedures
19 paid Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt security
20 guards on a bi-weekly basis.

21 41. These payroll policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Defendants' failure
22 to timely pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
23 not on a weekly basis as required by California law.

24 42. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
25 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
26 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

27 43. **Failure to timely pay earned wages during employment:** In California, wages
28 must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the

1 employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code section 204(a). Wages earned
2 between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 16th and
3 the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any
4 calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. *Id.* Other payroll
5 periods such as those that are weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly, must be paid within seven (7)
6 calendar days following the close of the payroll period in which wages were earned. Labor Code
7 section 204(d).

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

15 45. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
16 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
17 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

18 46. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
19 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
20 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
21 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by
22 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful
23 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,
24 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor
25 Code section 1198, the Defendant secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while
26 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

27 47. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
28 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section

1 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

2 48. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section
3 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an employee
4 his or her wages, the employer must “furnish each of his or her employees ... an itemized statement
5 in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any
6 employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
7 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare
8 Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
9 is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all deductions made on written orders
10 of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive
11 dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her
12 social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all
13 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
14 worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

15 49. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff
16 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
17 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period
18 premium wages) rendered Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based
19 hourly non-exempt employees’ wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section
20 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

21 50. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

22 51. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
23 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
24 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

6 54. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

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

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

14 57. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
15 section 2699.3. On April 1, 2025, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and provided
16 notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of the Labor
17 Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the violations alleged.

18 58. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by
19 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code
20 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the
21 parties notice within 60 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends
22 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

23 59. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
24 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7,
25 246, 510, 512, and 1194, During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present,
26 preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the
27 following amounts:

28 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, and 2802;

1 one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and
2 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent
3 violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

4 b. For violations of Labor Code section 226(a), alternatively, two hundred fifty
5 dollars (\$250) for each employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each
6 subsequent violation, one thousand dollars (\$1000) for each underpaid employee for each pay period
7 [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 226.3].

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

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

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

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

24 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

25 **WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND ON OTHER AGGRIEVED**
26 **EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:**

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

28 1. That Defendants be found to have violated the provisions of the Labor Code and the

1 IWC Wages Orders as to the Plaintiff and aggrieved employees;

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

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

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

9
10 Dated: May 29, 2025

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

11
12 By:



Joseph Lavi, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.
J. Jason Hill, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
HOMERO SANDOVAL,
on behalf of himself and others similarly situated