

MARALLE MESSRELIAN (SBN 316974)
maralle@mmlawapc.com
MM LAW, APC
500 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 2000
Glendale, CA 91203
Telephone (818) 810-7747
Facsimile (818) 230-9018

Attorneys for Plaintiff,
JESUS ASCENCIO CERRILLO

FILED
9/22/2025 8:00 AM
Clerk of the Napa Superior Court
By: Lori Walker, Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF NAPA
(UNLIMITED JURISDICTION)

JESUS ASCENCIO CERRILLO , as an
“aggrieved employee” on behalf of himself
and other similarly situated “aggrieved
employees” under the Labor Code Private
Attorneys General Act of 2004,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ATLAS VINEYARD MANAGEMENT LLC;
and DOES 1 to 25, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 25CV001963

**COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS
OF THE LABOR CODE AND CIVIL
PENALTIES UNDER THE LABOR
CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT OF 2004, LABOR
CODE §§ 2698, ET SEQ.**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff, Jesus Ascencio Cerrillo (hereafter “Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself, the State of
2 California, and the other Aggrieved Employees, complains and alleges as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this representative action under the Labor Code Private Attorneys
5 General Act of 2004, § 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) based on alleged violations of the California
6 Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 8-2001/13-2001 (hereafter “the Wage
7 Order”), against Defendants ATLAS VINEYARD MANAGEMENT LLC, and DOES 1 to 25,
8 inclusive (collectively “ATLAS” or “Defendants”).

9 2. As set forth in more detail below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants are liable to
10 him, the State of California, and the Aggrieved Employees (defined below), for civil penalties
11 and other related relief. These claims are based on Defendants’ failures to: 1) pay all wages,
12 including minimum, regular, overtime, and doubletime wages earned for all hours worked at the
13 correct rates of pay; 2) provide meal periods or pay correctly-calculated premium wages in lieu
14 thereof; 3) authorize and permit rest periods or pay correctly-calculated premium wages in lieu
15 thereof; 4) indemnify for business expenses; 5) issue only accurate and complete itemized wage
16 statements; 6) timely pay wages during employment; 7) timely pay wages upon separation from
17 employment; and 8) maintain accurate employment records. Accordingly, Plaintiff now seeks to
18 recover civil penalties and related relief through this representative action.

19 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

20 3. Jurisdiction and Venue are proper in this Court and this action is properly filed in
21 the County of Napa in this judicial district because Defendants ATLAS VINEYARD
22 MANAGEMENT LLC and DOES 1 to 25, inclusive do business in the County of Napa and
23 because Defendants’ obligations and liabilities arise therein, and because the work that was
24 performed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in the North County of San Diego is the
25 subject of this action.

26 **THE PARTIES**

27 4. Plaintiff Jesus Ascencio Cerrillo is resident of California.

28 5. Defendant ATLAS VINEYARD MANAGEMENT LLC is a limited liability

1 company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct
2 substantial business in California. As such, it is a citizen of California based on Plaintiff's
3 information and belief.

4 6. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships, and extents of
5 participation in the conduct alleged herein of the Defendants sued as DOES 1-25, inclusive, but
6 is informed and believes and thereon alleges that said Defendants are legally responsible for the
7 wrongful conduct alleged herein and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names.
8 Plaintiff will amend the Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants
9 when ascertained.

10 7. The "Aggrieved Employees" are all individuals the Defendants have employed or
11 otherwise contracted with as hourly, non-exempt employees, during the period beginning one
12 year before the Plaintiff's notice of June 30, 2025 to the California Labor and Workforce
13 Development Agency ("LWDA") and ending on the date judgment is entered (the "PAGA
14 Period").

15 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times
16 herein, all Defendants were the agents, employees and/or servants, masters or employers of the
17 remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, were acting within the course
18 and scope of such agency or employment, and with the approval and ratification of each of the
19 other Defendants.

20 9. At all relevant times, in perpetrating the acts and omissions alleged herein,
21 Defendants, and each of them, acted pursuant to and in furtherance of a policy, practice, or a lack
22 of a practice which resulted in Defendants not paying Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved
23 Employees in accordance with applicable California labor laws as alleged herein.

24 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each and every one of
25 the acts and omissions alleged herein were performed by, and/or attributable to, all Defendants,
26 each acting as agents and/or employees, and/or under the direction and control of each of the other
27 defendants, and that said acts and failures to act were within the course and scope of said agency,
28 employment, and/or direction and control.

1 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

2 11. Wage Order 8-2001 applies to “all persons employed in the industries handling
3 products after harvest whether paid on a time, piece rate, commission, or other basis.” § 1. Wage
4 Order 13-2001 applies to “all persons employed in industries preparing agricultural products for
5 market, on the farm, whether paid on a time, piece rate, commission, or other basis.” § 1. At all
6 relevant times during the applicable limitations period, ATLAS operated a vineyard management
7 company. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to the protections
8 afforded by the Wage Orders.

9 12. ATLAS first began to employ Plaintiff on or around March 2025 as laborer/tractor
10 driver to work at different vineyards located in Napa and Sonoma counties, including but not
11 limited to, J&S Lee Vineyard, Alta Vista Vineyard, Devaux, Rombauer Carriger, and Rombauer
12 Lone Pine. During his employment Plaintiff operated all types of vehicles at the vineyards,
13 planted grapes, and was also tasked with spraying chemicals using a tractor when he worked the
14 night shift. ATLAS continuously employed Plaintiff in that capacity until on or about June 16,
15 2025 when his employment ended.

16 13. At all relevant times, ATLAS issued wages to Plaintiff and all of the other
17 Aggrieved Employees on a weekly basis and paid them by the hour. Plaintiff’s latest rate of pay
18 was approximately \$24.00 per hour. At all relevant times, ATLAS classified Plaintiff and all of
19 the other Aggrieved Employees as non-exempt employees entitled to the protections of the Labor
20 Code and the Wage Order. ATLAS employed Plaintiff and all of the Aggrieved Employees more
21 than six, eight, and ten hours per day. During his tenure, Plaintiff was generally scheduled to work
22 Sunday to Friday, 8:00 p.m. to 5:30 a.m. when he worked the night shift and 6:00 a.m. to 2:30
23 p.m. when he worked the morning shift.

24 14. ATLAS failed to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked
25 or subject to its control. Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees were not paid for all hours
26 worked and consistently worked “off the clock” in that the company had a policy and practice of
27 “time shaving” and rounding down work hours to the detriment of employees, which is akin to a
28 minimum wage violation. There was no formal clock-in/clock out system and Plaintiff and the

1 other Aggrieved Employees did not fill out any timesheets. Instead, there was an individual
2 assigned to keep track of all of the employees' hours and would enter the time in and out for the
3 whole team of about 10 to 12 workers. Moreover, to the extent employees such as Plaintiff and
4 other Aggrieved Employees worked through their meal periods and those meal periods were
5 interrupted, they were not compensated for that time, which would be akin to a minimum wage
6 violation.

7 15. Due to the above "off the clock" violations, ATLAS failed to pay Plaintiff and the
8 Aggrieved Employees properly-calculated overtime wages. Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved
9 Employees' actual work hours, which included the "off the clock" work as described above,
10 entitled them to overtime, however, it was not company policy to keep accurate track of all hours
11 worked and to pay employees the accurate amount of overtime, especially since the "off the
12 clock" work was not factored into the equation. Plaintiff often worked more than 8 hours a day
13 and 40 hours per week. ATLAS did not compensate Plaintiff at the correct overtime rate for all
14 overtime work performed. Furthermore, any incentive payments and/or bonus payments were not
15 factored into employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of deciphering the correct overtime rate
16 of pay. In addition, any bonus and/or incentive payments were not factored into the correct meal
17 and rest break premium pay per *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal. 5th 858,
18 863.

19 16. ATLAS failed to provide all compliant meal periods and authorize and permit all
20 compliant rest periods to which Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees were entitled.
21 Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees were entitled to take off-duty, uninterrupted 30-
22 minute meal periods before the fifth and tenth hours of work and to take uninterrupted 10-minute
23 rest periods for every four hours or major fraction thereof worked. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
24 Employees would not be able to take timely, uninterrupted meal periods before the 5th or 10th
25 hour worked. For example, even though Plaintiff would begin his morning shift around 6:00 a.m.,
26 he would not be able to take a meal period until past 11 a.m. as he was instructed to complete
27 tasks prior to being able to take his meal period. On information and belief, ATLAS did not
28 provide premium wages for these meal and rest break violations; if ATLAS did provide premium

1 wages, they were not paid at the correct rate, as explained above.

2 17. ATLAS failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees for
3 business expenses they incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties. Plaintiff
4 purchased plastic work boots, towels, and a lamp to use at work during the night shifts. Plaintiff
5 also drove from job site to job site using his own personal vehicle. Moreover, ATLAS
6 management would consistently contact Plaintiff and the others on their personal cell phone
7 concerning work matters, including scheduling, which addresses to report to (in a group chat),
8 and requests for assistance. ATLAS did not provide Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees
9 with these uniform items, supplies, and mobile phones and did not reimburse Plaintiff and the
10 other Aggrieved Employees for these uniform, supplies, phone, and gas/mileage expenses.
11 Accordingly, ATLAS was in violation of California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.

12 18. ATLAS failed to pay its employees all wages due to them within any time period
13 specified by California Labor Code section 204, including the minimum wages and overtime as
14 described above as well as meal/rest break premiums. ATLAS did not provide Plaintiff and other
15 Aggrieved Employees accurate, itemized wage statements. Wage statements must include, among
16 other things, total hours worked by the employee. Labor Code § 226(a)(2). ATLAS issued wage
17 statements that inaccurately reflected total hours worked, gross and net wages earned, and the
18 number of hours worked at each hourly rate because of ATLAS's failure to properly pay wages
19 as explained herein. Labor Code §§ 226(a)(1), (2), (5), (9). ATLAS' failure to maintain accurate
20 records as to the hours worked daily by employees also constitutes a violation of Labor Code
21 section 1174(d).

22 19. Finally, because ATLAS did not properly pay all wages earned as explained
23 herein, ATLAS also failed to pay final wages owed to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees
24 in violation of Labor Code section 203. These earned but unpaid wages include minimum wages
25 and compensation for all hours worked, overtime compensation, premium pay for missed meal
26 and rest breaks, and business expense reimbursement, among others.

27 20. ATLAS has also violated Labor Code section 558 and engaged in business
28 practices which violate Business and Professions Code Section 17200.

21. Accordingly, Plaintiff now seeks civil penalties on behalf of himself and the Aggrieved Employees based on Defendants' alleged violations of the California Labor Code and the Wage Order.

FIRST (AND ONLY) CAUSE OF ACTION

CIVIL PENALTIES

(Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*)

(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the other Aggrieved Employees, against all Defendants)

22. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

23. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have been non-exempt employees entitled to the protections of both the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

A. FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES EARNED FOR ALL HOURS WORKED AT THE CORRECT RATES OF PAY

24. Section 2(G) of the Wage Order defines "hours worked" as "the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so."

25. Section 3 of the Wage Order states:

The following overtime provisions are applicable to employees 18 years of age or over and to employees 16 or 17 years of age who are not required by law to attend school and are not otherwise prohibited by law from engaging in the subject work. Such employees shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or more than 40 in a workweek unless the employee receives one and one half (1½) times such employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours in the workweek. Eight (8) hours of labor constitutes a day's work. Employment beyond eight (8) hours in any workday or more than six (6) days in any workweek is permissible provided the employee is compensated for such overtime at not less than:

- (a) One and one-half (1½) times the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours up to and including twelve (12) hours in any workday, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh (7th) consecutive day of work in a workweek;
- (b) Double the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of 12 hours in any workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh (7th) consecutive day of work in a workweek.
- (c) The overtime rate of compensation required to be paid to a nonexempt full-time salaried employee shall be computed by using the employee's

regular hourly salary as one fortieth (1/40) of the employee's weekly salary.

26. Section 4 of the Wage Order requires an employer to pay non-exempt employees at least the minimum wage set forth therein for all hours worked, which consists of all hours that an employer has actual or constructive knowledge that employees are working.

27. Labor Code section 510 states:

Eight hours of labor constitutes a day's work. Any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of 12 hours in one 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 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. Nothing in this section requires an employer to combine more than one rate of overtime compensation in order to calculate the amount to be paid to an employee for any hour of overtime work.

28. Labor Code section 1194 invalidates any agreement between an employer and an employee to work for less than the minimum wage required under the applicable Wage Order.

29. Labor Code section 1197 makes it unlawful for an employer to pay an employee less than the minimum wage required under the applicable Wage Order for all hours worked during a payroll period.

30. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful for an employer to employ an employee under conditions that violate the Wage Order.

31. In conjunction, these provisions of the Labor Code require employers to pay non-exempt employees no less than their agreed-upon or statutorily mandated wage rates for all hours worked, including unrecorded hours when the employer knew or reasonably should have known that employees were working during those hours. (See *Morillion v. Royal Packing Co.* (2000) 22 Cal.4th 575, 585.)

32. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including, but not limited to overtime wages for all overtime hours they worked at the correct rates of pay.

33. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, Defendants maintained a policy and/or practice, or lack thereof, which resulted in Defendants'

1 failure to compensate Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked as
2 required by California law.

3 **B. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

4 34. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 1198 states:

5 The maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor fixed by the
6 commission shall be the maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of
7 labor for employees. The employment of any employee for longer hours than those
8 fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.

9 35. In relevant part, In relevant part, California Labor Code § 512 states:

10 An employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of
11 more than five hours per day without providing the employee with
12 a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total
13 work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the
14 meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the
15 employer and employee.

16 An employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of
17 more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with
18 a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the
19 total hours worked is no more than 12 hours, the second meal
20 period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the
21 employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

22 36. In relevant part, Section 11 of the Wage Order states:

23 Meal Periods:

24 (A) No employer shall employ any person for a work period of
25 more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than
26 30 minutes, except that when a work period of not more than
27 six (6) hours will complete the day's work the meal period may
28 be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee.
Unless the employee is relieved of all duty during a 30 minute
meal period, the meal period shall be considered an "on duty"
meal period and counted as time worked. An "on duty" meal
period shall be permitted only when the nature of the work
prevents an employee from being relieved of all duty and when
by written agreement between the parties an on-the-job paid
meal period is agreed to. The written agreement shall state that
the employee may, in writing, revoke the agreement at any
time.

(D) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period

1 in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the
2 employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the
3 employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that
4 the meal period is not provided.

5 37. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 226.7 states:

6 (b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during
7 a meal or rest period mandated pursuant to an applicable
8 statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the
9 Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety
10 and Health Standards Board, or the Division of
11 Occupational Safety and Health.

12 (c) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period
13 or rest period in accordance with a state law, including, but
14 not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable
15 regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare
16 Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health
17 Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety
18 and Health, the employer shall pay the employee one
19 additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
20 compensation for each work day that the meal or rest
21 period is not provided.

22 38. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 512 and the Wage Order, Plaintiff and the
23 Aggrieved Employees were entitled to uninterrupted meal periods of at least 30 minutes for each
24 day they worked five or more hours. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 512, they were also
25 entitled to a second 30-minute meal period when they worked more than 10 hours in a workday.

26 39. Defendants intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
27 with all required timely 30-minute meal periods free from any work duties in accordance with the
28 Wage Order.

40. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
Employees with all timely and uninterrupted meal periods. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay
premium wages for days on which they failed to provide Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved
Employees with timely meal periods.

41. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times
within the applicable limitations period, Defendants had a policy, practice, or a lack of a policy
which resulted in Defendants not providing the and the Aggrieved Employees with all off-duty
meal periods required by California law.

1 **C. FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE AND PERMIT REST BREAKS**

2 42. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 1198 states:

3 The maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor
4 fixed by the commission shall be the maximum hours of work and
5 the standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment
of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or
under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.

6 43. In relevant part, Section 12 of the Wage Order states:

7 Rest Periods:

8 (A) Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take
9 rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
each work period. The authorized rest period time shall be based
10 on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net
rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof. However, a
11 rest period need not be authorized for employees whose total daily
work time is less than three and one-half (3 ½) hours. Authorized
12 rest period time shall be counted as hours worked for which there
shall be no deduction from wages.

13
14 (B) If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in
15 accordance with the applicable provisions of this order, the
employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the
16 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday
that the rest period is not provided.

17
18 44. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 226.7 states:

19 (b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during
20 a meal or rest period mandated pursuant to an applicable
statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the
21 Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety
and Health Standards Board, or the Division of
22 Occupational Safety and Health.

23 (c) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period
24 or rest period in accordance with a state law, including, but
not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable
25 regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare
Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health
26 Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety
and Health, the employer shall pay the employee one
27 additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
28 compensation for each work day that the meal or rest

period is not provided.

45. Pursuant to the Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to be authorized and permitted to take net rest breaks of at least ten minutes for each four-hour period of work, or major fraction thereof.

46. Defendants intentionally failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take all 10-minute rest periods free from any work duties in accordance with the Wage Order.

47. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take all timely rest periods. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay premium wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for days on which they failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees to take timely rest periods.

48. At all relevant times, due to high workload, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take ten-minute, paid, duty-free rest breaks every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. Defendants did not seek an exemption from the rest period protections of the Wage Order from the California Division of Labor Standards Enforcement. Moreover, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees premium wages on workdays they failed to authorize and permit them to take 10-minute rest periods every four hours worked or major fraction thereof.

49. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times within the applicable limitations period, Defendants had a policy, practice, or a lack of a policy which resulted in Defendants not authorizing and permitting Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take all rest breaks required by California law.

D. FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY

50. In pertinent part, California Labor Code section 2802(a) states, “An employer shall indemnify his or her employee[s] for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties.”

51. Labor Code section 1198 prohibits employers from employing their employees under conditions prohibited by the Wage Order.

52. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, as a condition for employment, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to incur certain business expenses. These costs include, but are not limited to, use of personal cell phones to

1 communicate with management concerning work matters, gas/mileage, work boots, a lamp, and
2 towels among others. However, ATLAS did not reimburse Plaintiff and the others for these
3 business expenses.

4 53. Therefore, Defendants failed to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
5 for expenditures incurred as a direct consequence of discharging their duties in violation of
6 California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.

7 54. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times,
8 Defendants maintained a policy and/practice, or lack thereof, which resulted in Defendants'
9 failure to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the reasonable expenses they
10 incurred during the course of performing their duties.

11 **E. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE AND COMPLETE WRITTEN WAGE**
12 **STATEMENTS**

13 55. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
14 Employees were entitled to receive, bi-weekly or at the time of each payment of wages, an
15 accurate itemized statement showing: a) gross wages earned; b) net wages earned; c) all applicable
16 hourly rates in effect during the pay period; and d) the corresponding number of hours worked at
17 each hourly rate by the employee.

18 56. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226, an employee is deemed to suffer injury
19 if the employer fails to provide a wage statement. Also, an employee is deemed to suffer injury if
20 the employer fails to provide accurate and complete information as required by California Labor
21 Code § 226(a) and the employee cannot "promptly and easily determine" from the wage statement
22 alone one or more of the following:

23 A. The amount of the gross wages or net wages paid to the employee during
24 the pay period or any of the other information required to be provided on the itemized wage
25 statement pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(a);

26 B. Which deductions the employer made from gross wages to determine the
27 net wages paid to the employee during the pay period;

28 C. The name and address of the employer and, if the employer is a farm labor
contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682 of the California Labor Code, the name
and address of the legal entity that secured the services of the employer during the pay period;

D. The name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or his social

1 security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number; and

2 E. The number of piece-rate units earned and the piece rate.

3 57. "Promptly and easily determine," as stated in California Labor Code § 226(e),
4 means a reasonable person would be able to readily ascertain the information without reference
5 to other documents or information.

6 58. As alleged herein, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
7 Defendants violated California Labor Code section 226 because they did not properly and
8 accurately itemize each employee's gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked,
9 the corresponding number of hours worked at each rate by the employee and other requirements
10 of California Labor Code section 226. Defendants failed to state in the wage statements they
11 issued to Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees all their hours worked and wages earned,
12 including, but not limited to, regular and overtime wages for work they performed off-the-clock
13 (as described above).

14 59. Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees with
15 accurate wage statements was knowing and intentional. Defendants had the ability to provide
16 Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees with accurate wage statements but intentionally
17 provided wage statements that Defendants knew were not accurate.

18 60. As a result of being provided with inaccurate wage statements by Defendants,
19 Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees have suffered injury. Their legal rights to receive
20 accurate wage statements were violated and they were misled about the amount of wages they
21 had actually earned and were owed. In addition, the absence of accurate information on their wage
22 statements prevented immediate challenges to Defendants' unlawful pay practices, has required
23 discovery and mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed, has caused
24 difficulty and expense in attempting to reconstruct time and pay records and/or has led to the
25 submission of inaccurate information about wages to state and federal government agencies.
26 Further, Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees were not able to ascertain from the wage
27 statements whether Defendants complied with their obligations under California Labor Code
28 section 226(a).

26 **F. UNTIMELY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT**

27 61. Labor Code § 204 states:

28 (a) All wages, other than those mentioned in Section 201,

1 201.3, 202, 204.1, or 204.2, earned by any person in any
2 employment are due and payable twice during each
3 calendar month, on days designated in advance by the
4 employer as the regular paydays. Labor performed
5 between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar
6 month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day
of the month during which the labor was performed, and
labor performed between the 16th and the last day,
inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for
between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. ...

7 (b) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this
8 section, all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal
9 work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the
next regular payroll period.

10 (2) An employer is in compliance with the
11 requirements of subdivision (a) of Section 226
12 relating to total hours worked by the employee, if
13 hours worked in excess of the normal work period
14 during the current pay period are itemized as
15 corrections on the paystub for the next regular pay
16 period. Any corrections set out in a subsequently
issued paystub shall state the inclusive dates of
the pay period for which the employer is
correcting its initial report of hours worked.

17 (c) However, when employees are covered by a collective
18 bargaining agreement that provides different pay
19 arrangements, those arrangements shall apply to the
covered employees.

20 (d) The requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied
21 by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or
22 semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than
23 seven calendar days following the close of the payroll
period.

24 62. Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all
25 hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including overtime. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff
26 and the Aggrieved Employees with all meal and rest periods in compliance with California laws.
27 Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with all premium wages
28 on workdays they failed to provide them with one or more meal or rest periods in compliance

1 with California laws. As a result, Defendants failed to timely pay all earned minimum, overtime,
2 and premium wages due during employment within the time periods set by California Labor Code
3 section 204.

4 **G. UNTIMELY FINAL WAGES**

5 63. Labor Code § 201 provides that all earned and unpaid wages of an employee who
6 is discharged are due and payable immediately at the time of discharge.

7 64. Labor Code § 202 provides that all earned and unpaid wages of an employee who
8 quits after providing at least 72-hours notice before quitting are due and payable at the time of
9 quitting and that all earned and unpaid wages of an employee who quits without providing at least
10 72-hours notice before quitting are due and payable within 72 hours.

11 65. By failing to pay earned minimum and premium wages to Plaintiff and the
12 Aggrieved Employees, Defendants failed to timely pay them all earned and unpaid wages in
13 violation of Labor Code § 201 or § 202.

14 66. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' failures to timely pay Plaintiff
15 and the Aggrieved Employees all of their earned and unpaid wages (described above) have been
16 willful in that, at all relevant times, Defendants have deliberately maintained policies and
17 practices that violate the requirements of the Labor Code and the Wage Order, even though at all
18 relevant times, they have had the ability to comply with those legal requirements.

19 **H. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE EMPLOYMENT RECORDS**

20 67. Labor Code § 1174 states:

21 Every person employing labor in this state shall:

22 ...

23 (c) Keep a record showing the names and addresses of all employees
employed and the ages of all minors.

24 (d) Keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments
25 at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours
26 worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate
27 units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees
employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall
28 be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the
commission, but in any case shall be kept on file for not less than three
years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee from maintaining a

personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units earned.

68. Labor Code § 1174.5 states:

Any person employing labor who willfully fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of Section 1174, or to allow any member of the commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).

69. Section 7 of the Wage Order states:

(A) Every employer shall keep accurate information with respect to each employee including the following:

- (1) Full name, home address, occupation and social security number.
- (2) Birth date, if under 18 years, and designation as a minor.
- (3) Time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, split shift intervals and total daily hours worked shall also be recorded. Meal periods during which operations cease and authorized rest periods need not be recorded.
- (4) Total wages paid each payroll period, including value of board, lodging, or other compensation actually furnished to the Employee.
- (5) Total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay. This information shall be made readily available to the employee upon reasonable request.
- (6) When a piece rate or incentive plan is in operation, piece rates or an explanation of the incentive plan formula shall be provided to employees. An accurate production record shall be maintained by the employer.

70. Labor Code § 1198 prohibits employers from employing their employees under conditions prohibited by the Wage Order.

71. On information and belief, Defendants have willfully failed to maintain the records required by § 1174 and Wage Order, including, but not limited to, the total premium wages earned for missed meal and rest periods, and records pertaining to all unpaid hours worked by Plaintiff

1 and the Aggrieved Employees.

2 72. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks an award of civil penalties against the Defendants on
3 behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows: (1) \$500 for each
4 aggrieved employee for each violation of Labor Code section 1174 (penalties set by Labor Code
5 section 1174.5); and (2) \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor
6 Code section 1198, and \$200 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per
7 pay period (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)).

8 **I. CIVIL PENALTIES SOUGHT**

9 73. During the applicable time period, Defendants violated California Labor Code
10 §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, 2802, and related Labor
11 Code statutes.

12 74. California Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on
13 behalf of themselves and other current or former employees, to bring a civil action to recover civil
14 penalties pursuant to the procedures specified in California Labor Code § 2699.3.

15 75. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
16 Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for each of the Defendants' violations of
17 California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198
18 and 2802 during the applicable limitations period in the following amounts:

19 A. For violations of California Labor Code § 204, one hundred dollars
20 (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation and two hundred dollars
21 (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent, willful or intentional violation
22 (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code § 210).

23 B. For violations of California Labor Code § 226, two hundred fifty dollars
24 (\$250.00) per employee for initial violation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000.00) per employee
25 for each subsequent violation (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code § 226.3).

26 C. For violations of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, fifty dollars
27 (\$50.00) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation for pay period for which the
28 employee was underpaid and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each underpaid employee for

1 each pay period for which the employee was underpaid (penalty amounts established by
2 California Labor Code § 558).

3 D. For violations of California Labor Code § 1174, five hundred dollars
4 (\$500.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation (penalty amounts established
5 by Labor Code § 1174.5).

6 E. For violations of California Labor Code § 1197, one hundred dollars
7 (\$100.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial and intentional violation and two hundred
8 fifty dollars (\$250.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period
9 (regardless of whether the initial violations were intentionally committed) (penalty amounts
10 established by California Labor Code § 1197.1).

11 F. For violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226.7, 1194,
12 1198, and 2802, one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for
13 each initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay
14 period for each subsequent violation (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code
15 § 2699(f)(2)).

16 **J. NOTICE TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND DEFENDANTS**

17 76. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in California
18 Labor Code § 2699.3. By letter dated June 30, 2025, Plaintiff gave written notice by certified mail
19 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendants of the specific
20 provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and
21 theories to support the alleged violations. The LWDA has failed to take action in response within
22 65 days of Plaintiff’s notice.

23 77. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g), Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
24 Employees are entitled to an award of civil penalties, reasonable attorneys’ fees, and costs in
25 connection with their claims for civil penalties.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

78. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Aggrieved Employees, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- A. Civil penalties;
- B. Costs of suit;
- C. Reasonable attorneys’ fees; and
- D. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all other Aggrieved Employees, hereby demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted,

MM LAW, APC

Dated: September 20, 2025

By: Maralle Messrelan
Maralle Messrelan, Esq.
Attorney for Plaintiff,
JESUS ASCENCIO CERRILLO , and
all others similarly situated