

Assigned for all purposes to: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Officer: Douglas Stern

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Danielle E. Montero, Esq. (SBN 333945)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
dmontero@lelawfirm.com
wht2@lelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs ROSA RAMIREZ and ISAIAS RAMOS,
on behalf of themselves and current and former aggrieved employees

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

ROSA RAMIREZ and ISAIAS RAMOS,
on behalf of themselves and other aggrieved
employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

COLOR MASTER, INC.; and DOES 1 to 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 22STCV38011

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFFS ROSA RAMIREZ and
ISAIAS RAMOS' COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiffs ROSA RAMIREZ and ISAIAS RAMOS ("Plaintiff"), who
alleges and complains against Defendants COLOR MASTER, INC.; and DOES 1 to 100,
inclusive (collectively "Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Private Attorneys' General Act of 2004, Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*
("PAGA") representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California,
themselves and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as
hourly non-exempt employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties

1 associated with Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' for failure to pay
2 wages for all hours worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate
3 of pay; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant meal periods or pay
4 meal period premium wages; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant
5 rest periods or pay rest period premium wages; statutory penalties for failure to timely pay earned
6 wages during employment; statutory penalties for failure to provide accurate wage statements;
7 statutory waiting time penalties in the form of continuation wages for failure to timely pay
8 employees all wages due upon separation of employment. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis,
9 following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable
10 attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff,
11 the State of California, and others aggrieved.

12 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
14 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
15 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
16 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars
17 (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
18 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
19 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
20 California, including but not limited to Los Angeles County, at 5801 S. 2nd Street, Vernon,
21 California 90058.

22 3. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Judicial Council of California enacted
23 Emergency Rule 9 to the California Rules of Court, which provided that, notwithstanding any
24 other law, the statutes of limitations and repose for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are
25 tolled from April 6, 2020, until October 1, 2020.

26 **III. PARTIES**

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

1 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiffs 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
3 work for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
4 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California.

5 5. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff ROSA RAMIREZ is and was domiciled
6 and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by Defendants in an hourly position at
7 Defendants' location in Los Angeles from in or around February 2016, until on or about October
8 1, 2021.

9 6. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff ISAIAS RAMOS is and was domiciled and
10 a resident and citizen of California and was employed by Defendants in an hourly position at
11 Defendants' location in Los Angeles from in or around April 2016, until on or about October 1,
12 2021.

13 7. Plaintiffs are informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant COLOR
14 MASTER, INC. is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business
15 in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant hereto
16 were persons acting on behalf of Defendant COLOR MASTER, INC. in the establishment of, or
17 ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant COLOR
18 MASTER, INC. operates in Los Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and putative class
19 members in Los Angeles County, including but not limited to, at 5801 S. 2nd Street, Vernon,
20 California 90058.

21 8. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon alleges that Defendant DOES 51-
22 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiffs. Each of the individual Defendant is sued individually in
23 his or her capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner, representative, supervisor, independent
24 contractor and/or employee of each Defendant and participated in the establishment of, or
25 ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies.

26 9. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100. Plaintiff
27 sues said defendants by said fictitious names, and will amend this complaint when the true names
28 and capacities are ascertained or when such facts pertaining to liability are ascertained, or as

1 permitted by law or by the Court. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously
2 named defendants is in some manner responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this
3 complaint.

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

7 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

10 **(Against all Defendants by Plaintiffs)**

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

12 12. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding Plaintiff sending the initial
13 PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201,
14 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197 and Sections 14 and 15 of the applicable Wage
15 Orders.

16 13. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California
17 Labor Code:

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

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

27 16. In this case, Plaintiffs and other current and former aggrieved California-based
28 hourly non-exempt employees worked more minutes per shift than Defendants credited them with

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

5 (a) "Rounding" down or "shaving" Plaintiffs and other current and former aggrieved
6 California-based hourly non-exempt employees total daily hours at the time of their clock-ins and
7 clock-outs, including clock-ins and clock-outs for meal breaks, to the nearest quarter of an hour, to
8 the benefit of Defendants; and

9 (b) Since the outbreak of COVID-19, requiring Plaintiffs and other current and former
10 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees were to arrive prior to their start shift to
11 line up and wait to undergo and undergo off-the-clock COVID-19 temperature check and/or
12 medical questionnaires prior to being permitted to clock-in for their shift.

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

19 18. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay:**
20 Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff,s 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
23 employee is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either
24 directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to the benefit of the employer.'

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

28 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40)
hours in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of

work in any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-one-half (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve (12) hours in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an employee.

Labor Code section 510.

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

(a) "Rounding" down or "shaving" Plaintiffs and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees total daily hours at the time of their clock-ins and clock-outs, including clock-ins and clock-outs for meal breaks, to the nearest quarter of an hour, to the benefit of Defendants; and

(b) Since the outbreak of COVID-19, requiring Plaintiffs and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees were to arrive prior to their start shift to line up and wait to undergo and undergo off-the-clock COVID-19 temperature check and/or medical questionnaires prior to being permitted to clock-in for their shift.

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

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

23. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an

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

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

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

(a) "Rounding" down or "shaving" Plaintiffs and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees total daily hours at the time of their clock-ins and clock-outs, including clock-ins and clock-outs for meal breaks, to the nearest quarter of an hour, to the benefit of Defendants.

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

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

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

9 29. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
10 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor
11 Code section 226.7; Wage Order 1 at §12. Under California law, "[e]mployees are entitled to 10
12 minutes' rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more
13 than six hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so
14 on." *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code
15 section 226.7; Wage Order 9 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of
16 each work period. Wage Order 1 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement "obligates
17 employers to permit – and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods." *Augustus v. ABM*
18 *Security Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must
19 relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

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

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

28 (a) Requiring Plaintiffs and other current and former aggrieved California-based

1 hourly non-exempt employees to remain on Defendant's premises during their rest breaks
2 resulting rest periods that are on-duty and/or less than ten (10) minutes.

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

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

12 34. **Failure to timely pay earned wages during employment:** In California, wages
13 must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the
14 employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code section 204(a). Wages
15 earned between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the
16 16th and the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day,
17 inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following
18 month. *Id.* Other payroll periods such as those that are weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly, must be
19 paid within seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period in which wages were
20 earned. Labor Code section 204(d).

21 35. As a derivative of Plaintiff's claims above, Plaintiffs alleges that Defendants failed
22 to timely pay Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
23 exempt employees' earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period
24 premium wages and/or rest period premium wages), in violation of Labor Code section 204.
25 Defendants' aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in their failure to pay
26 Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees'
27 their earned wages within the applicable time frames outlined in Labor Code section 204.

28 36. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section

226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an employee his or her wages, the employer must “furnish each of his or her employees ... an itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, (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 pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her 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.”

37. As a derivative of Plaintiffs’ allegations above, Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiffs and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period premium wages) rendered Plaintiffs’ and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees’ wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section 226.

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

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

40. Defendants’ violations of Wage Order 1 constituted violations of Labor Code

1 section 1198, which prohibits employment under conditions of labor that violate the Wage Orders.

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

6 42. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor
7 Code section 2699.3. On September 29, 2022, Plaintiffs filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the
8 LWDA and provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific
9 provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to
10 support the violations alleged.

11 43. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by
12 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code
13 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the
14 parties notice within 60 days of the date of Plaintiffs' PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends
15 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

16 44. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiffs is entitled to recover
17 civil penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204 226, 226.7,
18 510, 512, 1194, 1197 beginning one (1) year preceding Plaintiffs sending the initial PAGA Claim
19 Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the following amounts:

20 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226.7, 2802, 512,
21 and 1198; one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial
22 violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each
23 subsequent violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

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

28 c. For violations of Labor Code section 510, fifty dollars (\$50) for each

1 employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, one
2 hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts
3 established by Labor Code section 558] and any unpaid wages.

4 d. For violations of Labor Code section 1194 and 1197, one hundred dollars
5 (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each
6 subsequent violation, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay
7 period [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 1197.1] and any unpaid wages.

8 45. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g), Plaintiffs is entitled to an award of
9 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with their claims for civil penalties.

10 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

11 **WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF THEMSELVES AND ON OTHER**
12 **AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:**

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

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

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

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

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

23 Dated: December 26, 2022

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

24
25 By: *Vincent C. Granberry*
26 Joseph Lavi, Esq.
27 Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
28 Danielle E. Montero, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs
ROSA RAMIREZ and ISAIAS RAMOS
on behalf of themselves and current and
former aggrieved employees