

SAN LUIS OBISPO SUPERIOR COURT  
BY: C. M. Kastner  
C. M. Kastner, Deputy Clerk

John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)  
[john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com](mailto:john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com)  
William M. Pao (SBN 219846)  
[william.pao@wilshirelawfirm.com](mailto:william.pao@wilshirelawfirm.com)  
Refugio Ortega-Carrillo (SBN 346933)  
[refugio.ortegacarrillo@wilshirelawfirm.com](mailto:refugio.ortegacarrillo@wilshirelawfirm.com)  
**WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC**  
660 S. Figueroa Street, Sky Lobby  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Telephone (213) 381-9988  
Facsimile (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for *Plaintiff*  
ESTEPHANY SALAS VAZQUEZ

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
**FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO**  
**COMPLEX CIVIL LITIGATION**

ESTEPHANY SALAS VAZQUEZ, individually,  
and on behalf of the State of California and other  
aggrieved persons,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

CENTRAL COAST STAR, LLC, a California  
limited liability company; and DOES 1 through  
10, inclusive,

*Defendants.*

Case No. 25CVP-0280

**PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION  
COMPLAINT:**

1. Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab.  
Code § 2699, et seq.]

1 Plaintiff Estephany Salas Vazquez (“Plaintiff”), on information and belief, alleges as  
2 follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this action individually, and on behalf of the State of California and  
5 other aggrieved persons, against Defendant Central Coast Star, LLC, and DOES 1 through 10  
6 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General  
7 Act of 2004, California Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.* (“PAGA”) stemming from Defendants’ failure  
8 to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failure to provide meal  
9 periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to pay all earned wages twice per  
10 month, failure to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failure to timely  
11 pay final wages, failure to furnish accurate wage statements, and failure to indemnify employees  
12 for expenditures.

13 2. For over 50 years, California’s courts and Legislature have recognized that this  
14 State’s wage-and-hour laws serve a compelling public interest of fostering a stable job market.  
15 Wages are not ordinary debts. Because of the economic position of the average worker and his or  
16 her family, it is essential to the public welfare that employers obey the wage-and-hour laws so that  
17 employees are promptly paid the minimum/overtime wages that the Legislature has required for  
18 employees. So fundamental are California’s wage-and-hour laws that the Legislature has  
19 criminalized certain types of violations. In extending extra protection to deter violations of these  
20 underlying statutes—since Plaintiff is not seeking general and/or special damages, restitution, or  
21 other damages other than civil penalties—California has enacted PAGA to permit an individual to  
22 bring an action for PAGA penalties only, which is the precise and sole nature of this action.

23 3. All California employees during the relevant period who are or were harmed by  
24 Defendants’ illegal practices are “Aggrieved Employees.” The Aggrieved Employees worked for  
25 Defendants as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the applicable period.

26 4. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants seeking only to recover penalties on  
27 behalf of Plaintiff individually, on behalf of certain Aggrieved Employees that worked for  
28 Defendants, and on behalf of the State of California. Plaintiff does not seek to recover anything

1 other than penalties as permitted by California Labor Code Section 2699 at this time. To the extent  
2 that statutory violations are mentioned for wage violations, Plaintiff does not seek underlying  
3 general and/or special damages for those violations, but simply penalties as permitted by California  
4 Labor Code Section 2699, declaratory relief, and injunctive relief for Plaintiff individually, and  
5 certain Aggrieved Employees as permitted by the PAGA.

6 5. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and  
7 establishment within the State of California. As such and based upon all the facts and  
8 circumstances incident to Defendants' businesses in California, Defendants are subject to the  
9 California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC"), and  
10 the California Business & Professions Code.

11 6. On information and belief, Defendants were on actual and constructive notice of the  
12 improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their unlawful conduct.  
13 Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were willful and  
14 deliberate.

15 7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the  
16 unlawful conduct, policies, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing  
17 paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants are  
18 responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of  
19 "respondeat superior."

## 20 **THE PARTIES**

21 8. Plaintiff Estephany Salas Vazquez is a resident of Lompoc, California.

22 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief  
23 alleges, that Defendant Central Coast Star, LLC is, and at all times herein mentioned, was:

24 (a) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the  
25 State of California; and,

26 (b) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer of  
27 Aggrieved Employees, because Defendant Central Coast Star, LLC suffered  
28 and permitted Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to work; and/or controlled

1                   their wages, hours, or working conditions; and or engaged Plaintiff and  
2                   Aggrieved Employees, thereby creating a common law employment  
3                   relationship.

4           10.     Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued  
5     herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each  
6     of the Doe Defendants were in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by  
7     Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiff will amend this complaint  
8     to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained,  
9     together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

10          11.     At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and  
11     each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or  
12     injured a significant number of the Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees in the State of California.

13          12.     Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times each  
14     Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and the  
15     other employees and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff  
16     is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the  
17     principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, joint employer, officer, director, controlling shareholder,  
18     subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or predecessor in interest of some  
19     or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other Defendants in a joint  
20     enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as  
21     to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below. Plaintiff is informed and  
22     believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the scope of the  
23     relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have known about, and  
24     authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other  
25     Defendants.

26                   **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

27          13.     Plaintiff worked for Defendants in San Luis Obispo County, California as an hourly-  
28     paid, non-exempt employee from approximately June 2024 to approximately March 2025. At all

1 times, Defendants paid Plaintiff an hourly wage and classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from  
2 overtime.

3 14. Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendants committed numerous labor code  
4 violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendants was  
5 typical and illustrative.

6 **A. Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Minimum, Straight Time, and**  
7 **Overtime Wages**

8 15. Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee.  
9 "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and  
10 includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do  
11 so.

12 16. Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more  
13 than eight hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional  
14 compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

15 17. Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not  
16 be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation  
17 beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states  
18 that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the IWC is unlawful.

19 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants, at times, failed to pay Plaintiff and  
20 certain Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time, and  
21 overtime wages. Defendants, at times, required Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved Employees to work  
22 "off-the-clock," uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved  
23 Employees to perform work during uncompensated meal periods and/or requiring Plaintiff and  
24 certain Aggrieved Employees to perform work after clocking out for the workday. Some of this  
25 unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked,  
26 Defendants also failed, at times, to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and certain  
27 Aggrieved Employees worked.

28 ///

**B. Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

19. Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the end of the fifth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute meal period no later than the end of the tenth hour of work in a workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with a required meal period(s).

20. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants wrongfully failed, at times, to provide Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, with their legally mandated 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period in a manner required by law. Defendants also continued to assert control over Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, by, among other things, requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory meal periods, or by denying Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved Employees permission to take a meal period under the conditions required by law, and without properly compensating Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, for meal periods that were not provided as required by law. Defendants also failed, at times, to permit Plaintiff to take a second meal period when Plaintiff worked at least ten hours of work in a workday. Accordingly, Defendants failed, at times, to provide meal periods to Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

21. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s). Defendants, however, at times, failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods that were not provided.

**C. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Breaks**

22. Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of ten uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself

1 a violation of California's rest break laws.

2 23. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have, at times, wrongfully failed to  
3 authorize and permit Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, to take legally  
4 compliant rest periods in a manner required by law. Defendants, at times, also required Plaintiff  
5 and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day  
6 without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free  
7 rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), and without properly  
8 compensating Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, for rest periods that were not  
9 authorized or permitted. Instead, among other things, Defendants continued to assert control over  
10 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging  
11 them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking  
12 mandatory rest periods, and by denying Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them,  
13 permission to take a rest period under the conditions required by law. Accordingly, Defendants  
14 failed, at times, to authorize and permit Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, to  
15 take rest periods in compliance with California law.

16 24. Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of  
17 additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required  
18 rest periods. Defendants, however, at times, failed to pay Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved  
19 Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not  
20 authorized and permitted to take.

21 **D. Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month**

22 25. Based on Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved Employees for  
23 all wages as discussed above, Defendants also violated Labor Code § 204.

24 26. Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times  
25 per month. Throughout the period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be  
26 paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest  
27 period premium wages owed, and wages owed for overtime hours worked. However, Defendants,  
28 at times, failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed, at times, to pay those

wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendants, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendants, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Defendants owe employees the legally required wages not paid, and Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

**E. Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods**

27. Plaintiff seeks penalties under California Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

28. Defendants, however, at times, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved Employees.

29. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records required by the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendants' records. Therefore, Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform Defendants' obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendants' knowing failure to comply with the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

**F. Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination**

30. Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee,

1 the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if  
2 an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and  
3 payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-  
4 two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled  
5 to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

6 31. Within the applicable period, the employment of Plaintiff and many other  
7 Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e., was terminated by quitting or being discharged, and the  
8 employment of others will be terminated. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants at  
9 times failed, and continue to fail, to pay Plaintiff and certain terminated Aggrieved Employees,  
10 without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the  
11 time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employment.  
12 These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum, straight time, and  
13 overtime wages), missed meal period premium wages, and missed rest period premium wages.

14 32. Defendants' conduct violates Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Labor Code § 203  
15 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201  
16 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and  
17 at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for  
18 more than thirty (30) days.

19 33. Accordingly, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, are entitled to  
20 recover from Defendants their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their  
21 regular hourly rate of pay, up to thirty (30) days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

22 **G. Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

23 34. Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her  
24 employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information,  
25 including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-  
26 rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all  
27 deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated  
28 and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the

1 employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security  
2 number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name  
3 and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect  
4 during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the  
5 employee. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Labor Code  
6 § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

7 35. The statute further provides: “An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing  
8 and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the  
9 greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation  
10 occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period,  
11 not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award  
12 of costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.” (Labor Code § 226(e)(1).)

13 36. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed, at times, to furnish Plaintiff and  
14 Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all  
15 applicable hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct  
16 wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct  
17 wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California  
18 law). Because Defendants violated Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved  
19 Employees, or some of them, suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.  
20 Accordingly, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, are entitled to recover  
21 damages from Defendants including the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants’  
22 failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand  
23 dollars (\$4,000) dollars per employee, or as otherwise permitted by PAGA based upon all bases of  
24 liability.

25 **H. Failure to Indemnify for Necessary Expenditures**

26 37. Labor Code § 2802(a) provides that employers shall indemnify their employees for  
27 all necessary business expenditures or losses that have been incurred by the employees in direct  
28 discharge of his or her duties. Throughout the period applicable to this cause of action, Defendants

1 wrongfully required Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred  
2 in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants. Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees, or  
3 some of them, paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses, including, without  
4 limitation, cell phone expenses and mileage. Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees, or some  
5 of them, incurred substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for  
6 Defendants, but Defendants failed, at times, to indemnify Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved  
7 Employees for these employment-related expenses.

8 38. As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved Employees for  
9 the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2699(f)(2) for failing to indemnify  
10 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenditures.

### 11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### 12 **(By All Plaintiffs Against All Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys** 13 **General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.)**

14 39. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges all preceding paragraphs as though  
15 fully set forth herein.

16 40. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the  
17 State of California and the applicable IWC Orders.

18 41. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action  
19 to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law,  
20 any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor  
21 and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,  
22 agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a  
23 civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of herself or himself and other current or  
24 former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.”

25 42. Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing pursuant to California Labor Code §  
26 2699.3 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of  
27 the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and  
28 certain current and former Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, including the facts and theories

1 to support the violations. Plaintiff also paid the filing fee. Plaintiff's PAGA case number is LWDA-  
2 CM-1098244-25. The Labor and Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends  
3 to investigate Defendants' Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Plaintiff hereby  
4 commences a civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for  
5 the violations of the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not  
6 limited to, penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699.

7 43. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiff is entitled to an award  
8 of civil penalties individually, on behalf of the State of California and certain similarly Aggrieved  
9 Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount to  
10 be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted  
11 by law.

12 44. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant  
13 to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in any action shall be  
14 entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

### 15 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

16 Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of all similarly  
17 Aggrieved Employees, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as  
18 follows:

19 1. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California  
20 Labor Code by failing to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages),  
21 failing to provide meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, failing to pay all earned  
22 wages twice per month, failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods,  
23 failing to timely pay final wages, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to  
24 indemnify for necessary expenditures;

25 2. An award of civil penalties on behalf of Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the  
26 State of California, and all similarly Aggrieved Employees pursuant to PAGA;

27 3. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate allowed;

28 4. Attorneys' fees and costs reasonably incurred;

5. Injunctive and declaratory relief to the extent allowed by PAGA; and,
6. Such other and further relief that the Court deems proper.

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: July 23, 2025

**WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC**

By: *Refugio Ortega-Carrillo*  
JOHN G. YSLAS  
WILLIAM M. PAO  
REFUGIO ORTEGA-CARRILLO  
Attorneys for *Plaintiff*  
ESTEPHANY SALAS VAZQUEZ