

Assigned for all purposes to: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Officer: Teresa Beaudet

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Pooja V. Patel, Esq. (SBN 317891)
Courtney Miller, Esq. (SBN 327850)
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
ppatel@lelawfirm.com
cmiller@lelawfirm.com
WHT1@lelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff CHRISTOPHER SOLIS,
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**

CHRISTOPHER SOLIS on behalf of himself
and other aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MICHAEL STORES PROCUREMENT
COMPANY, INC.; and DOES 1 to 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **23STCV01014**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF CHRISTOPHER SOLIS'
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff CHRISTOPHER SOLIS ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains
against Defendants MICHAEL STORES PROCUREMENT COMPANY, INC. 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 employees in California from October 2, 2021 to the present for failure to pay all overtime

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

11 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

12 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
13 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
14 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
15 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars
16 (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
17 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
18 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
19 California, including but not limited to Los Angeles County, at 3501 W. Avenue H #8, Lancaster,
20 California 93536.

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

25 **III. PARTIES**

26 4. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
27 Development Agency on behalf of himself and other current and former employees subject to
28 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is

1 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will
2 work for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
3 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the
4 currently named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was
5 employed by Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Los Angeles from in or
6 around October 2021 to July 22, 2022.

7 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant MICHAEL
8 STORES PROCUREMENT COMPANY, INC. is authorized to do business within the State of
9 California and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are,
10 and at all times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant MICHAEL STORES
11 PROCUREMENT COMPANY, INC. in the establishment of, or ratification of, the
12 aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant MICHAEL STORES
13 PROCUREMENT COMPANY, INC. operates in Los Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and
14 aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County, including but not limited to, at 3501 W. Avenue H
15 #8, Lancaster, California 93536.

16 6. 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
20 working conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

21 7. 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
25 be violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor Code and/or any provision of
26 the Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

27 8. 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 9. 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
7 Plaintiff reserves all of Plaintiff's right to plead in the alternative.

8 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **CIVIL PENALTIES AND WAGES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS**

10 **GENERAL ACT OF 2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

11 **(Against all Defendants by Plaintiff)**

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

13 11. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding Plaintiff sending the initial
14 PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201,
15 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 1194, and Sections 14 and 15 of the applicable Wage
16 Orders.

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

19 13. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay:**
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
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 14. 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.

15. Overtime is based upon an employee's regular rate of pay. "The regular rate at which an employee is employed shall be deemed to include all remuneration for employment paid to, or on behalf, of the employee." See Division of Labor Standards Enforcement – Enforcement Policies and Interpretations Manual, Section 49.1.2.

16. From on or around October 2, 2021 to present, Plaintiff alleges that when he and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees earned overtime wages, Defendants failed to pay them overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay due to Defendants' failure to include all remuneration when calculating the overtime rate of pay. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as, for example, shift differential and bonus pay in the regular rate of pay when calculating Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying overtime wages.

17. 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 Plaintiff 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.

18. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant meal periods:** Plaintiff 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.

1 19. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an
2 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of
3 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the
4 employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512; Wage Order 9 at §11; *Brinker*
5 *Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ an
6 employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee
7 with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh
8 hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period
9 shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. A paid "on duty" meal
10 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being
11 relieved of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

12 20. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
13 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay
14 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
15 section 226.7; Wage Order 9 at §11.

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

20 (a) From on or around October 2, 2021, to present, Defendant failed to provide
21 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
22 second uninterrupted duty-free meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes no later than the end
23 of their tenth hour of work.

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

1 section 226.7.

2 23. Finally, from on or around October 2, 2021, to present, on occasions Defendants
3 did pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
4 employees “premium” wage for late, missed, short, on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted meal
5 periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff and other current
6 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regular rate of
7 compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing
8 to include all remuneration such as, for example, shift differential and bonus pay in the regular rate
9 of pay for purposes of calculating Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
10 based hourly non-exempt employees regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying meal period
11 premium wages.

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

16 25. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
17 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant rest periods:** Plaintiff and other
18 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked
19 shifts of more than three-and-a-half (3.5) hours.

20 26. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
21 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor
22 Code section 226.7; Wage Order 9 at §12. Under California law, “[e]mployees are entitled to 10
23 minutes’ rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more
24 than six hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so
25 on.” *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code
26 section 226.7; Wage Order 9 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of
27 each work period. Wage Order 9 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement “obligates
28 employers to permit – and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM*

1 *Security Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must
2 relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

3 27. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer
4 must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday
5 the employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7;
6 Wage Order 9 at § 12.

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

11 (a) From on or around October 2, 2021, to present, Defendant failed to provide
12 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
13 third timely uninterrupted duty-free rest period of a net ten (10) minutes for shifts exceeding ten
14 (10) hours.

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

20 30. Finally, from on or around October 2, 2021 to present, on occasions Defendants did
21 pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
22 employees a "premium" wage for late, missed, short, on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted rest
23 periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff and other current
24 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regular rate of
25 compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing
26 to include all remuneration such as, for example, shift differential and bonus pay when calculating
27 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
28 regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying rest period premiums.

1 31. 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 in which Defendants did not provide them with
4 rest periods in compliance with California law.

5 32. **Failure to pay wages for accrued paid sick days at the regular rate of pay:**
6 Defendants had a policy and/or procedure where Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
7 California-based hourly non-exempt employees accrued paid sick time.

8 33. Labor Code section 246, subdivision (a), states in relevant part “[a]n employee
9 who...works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the
10 commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days.” Additionally, an employee accrues
11 paid sick days at the rate of no-less-than one (1) hour per every thirty (30) hours worked,
12 beginning at the commencement of employment. Labor Code section 246(b).

13 34. Here, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
14 exempt employees were employed by Defendants for 30 or more days and were entitled to paid
15 sick days. Also, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
16 exempt employees began accruing paid sick days from on or around October 2, 2021, to present.

17 35. Labor Code section 246, subdivision (l), provides that an employer shall calculate
18 the paid sick time for non-exempt employees in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the
19 workweek in which the employee elected to use paid sick time. “The regular rate at which an
20 employee is employed shall be deemed to include all remuneration for employment paid to, or on
21 behalf, of the employee.” See Division of Labor Standards Enforcement – Enforcement Policies
22 and Interpretations Manual, Section 49.1.2.

23 36. In this case, Plaintiff alleges that when he and other current and former aggrieved
24 California-based hourly non-exempt employees elected to use paid sick time, Defendants failed to
25 pay them sick time wages at the proper sick time rate of pay due to Defendants’ failure to include
26 all remuneration when calculating the sick time rate of pay. Specifically, Defendants maintained a
27 policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as, for example, shift
28 differential and bonus pay when calculating Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved

1 California-based hourly non-exempt employees regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying sick
2 time.

3 37. Defendants' foregoing policy, practice, and/or procedure resulted in Defendants
4 failing to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
5 employees at their sick time regular rate of pay for all sick time accrued, in violation of Labor
6 Code section 246.

7 38. **Failure to timely pay earned wages during employment:** In California, wages
8 must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the
9 employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code section 204(a). Wages
10 earned between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the
11 16th and the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day,
12 inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following
13 month. *Id.* Other payroll periods such as those that are weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly, must be
14 paid within seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period in which wages were
15 earned. Labor Code section 204(d).

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

23 40. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section
24 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an
25 employee his or her wages, the employer must "furnish each of his or her employees ... an
26 itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the
27 employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is
28 exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of

1 the Industrial Welfare Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable
2 piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all
3 deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5)
4 net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the
5 name of the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal
6 entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
7 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

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

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

17 43. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, because Defendants failed to pay
18 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
19 all their earned wages (including Overtime wages for overtime hours worked, meal period
20 premium wages, and/or rest period premium wages), Defendants failed to pay those employees
21 timely after each employee’s termination and/or resignation, in violation of Labor Code sections
22 201, 202, and 203.

23 44. Defendants’ violations of Wage Order 9 constituted violations of Labor Code
24 section 1198, which prohibits employment under conditions of labor that violate the Wage Orders.

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

1 46. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor
2 Code section 2699.3. On November 11, 2022, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the
3 LWDA and provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific
4 provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to
5 support the violations alleged.

6 47. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by
7 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code
8 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the
9 parties notice within 60 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends
10 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

11 48. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
12 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204 226, 226.7, 246,
13 510, 512, 1194, beginning one (1) year preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice
14 to the LWDA to the present, in the following amounts:

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

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

23 c. For violations of Labor Code section 510, fifty dollars (\$50) for each
24 employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, one
25 hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts
26 established by Labor Code section 558] and any unpaid wages.

27 d. For violations of Labor Code section 1194 and 1197, one hundred dollars
28 (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each

subsequent violation, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 1197.1] and any unpaid wages.

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

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

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

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

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

Dated: January 17, 2023

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

By: 

Joseph Lavi, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Pooja V. Patel, Esq.
Courtney M. Miller, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
CHRISTOPHER SOLIS,
on behalf of himself and current and former
aggrieved employees