

E-FILED
8/25/2025 2:54 PM
Clerk of Court
Superior Court of CA,
County of Santa Clara
25CV473613
Reviewed By: Y. Chavez

John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)
john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com
Arrash T. Fattahi (SBN 333676)
arrash.fattahi@wilshirelawfirm.com
Arman A. Salehi (SBN 351112)
arman.salehi@wilshirelawfirm.com

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

660 S. Figueroa Street, Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA**

ANDRES DE JESUS HERNANDEZ, on behalf
of the State of California and other aggrieved
persons,

Plaintiff,

v.

WALLCRAFT DRYWALL, INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 25CV473613

**PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

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

1 Plaintiff ANDRES DE JESUS HERNANDEZ (“Plaintiff”), based upon facts that either
2 have evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity
3 for further investigation and discovery, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

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

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

25 3. All California employees during the relevant statutes of limitations who are or
26 were harmed by Defendant’s illegal practices are “Aggrieved Employees.” The Aggrieved
27 Employees worked for Defendant as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the
28 applicable statutory period.

4. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants seeking only to recover penalties on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees that worked for Defendants, and on behalf of the State of California. Plaintiff does not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by California Labor Code Section 2699 at this time. To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for wage violations, Plaintiff does not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those violations, but simply penalties as permitted by California Labor Code Section 2699, declaratory relief, and injunctive relief for himself and all Aggrieved Employees as permitted by the PAGA.

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

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

7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing paragraphs as the employers of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of “respondeat superior”.

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

8. Plaintiff ANDRES DE JESUS HERNANDEZ is a resident of Santa Clara County, California who worked for Defendants in Santa Clara County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately February 2023 to approximately June 2024.

B. Defendants

9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendant WALLCRAFT DRYWALL, INC. is, and at all times herein mentioned, was:

1 (a) A California corporation qualified to do business and actually conducting
2 business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including
3 in Santa Clara County; and

4 (b) The former employer of Plaintiff and the current and/or former employer of
5 the Aggrieved Employees because Defendant WALLCRAFT DRYWALL,
6 INC. suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
7 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

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

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

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

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

2 13. Plaintiff worked for Defendants in Santa Clara County, California as an hourly-
3 paid, non-exempt employee from approximately February 2023 to approximately June 2024.
4 During Plaintiff's employment for Defendants, Defendants paid Plaintiff an hourly wage and
5 classified him as non-exempt from overtime. Defendants typically scheduled Plaintiff to work at
6 least five days in a workweek and at least eight hours per day, but Plaintiff regularly worked more
7 than eight hours in a workday and/or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

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

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

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

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

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

24 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not
25 paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum, straight
26 time, and overtime wages. Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work
27 "off-the-clock," uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
28 to perform work before clocking in for the work day, during unpaid meal periods, and after

1 clocking out for the work day. Some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime
2 rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of
3 the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

4 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants used a system of time rounding and/or
5 synthetic timekeeping that resulted, over a period of time, in failing to compensate Plaintiff and
6 the Aggrieved Employees properly for all the time they have actually worked, even though the
7 realities of Defendants' operations are such that it is possible, practical, and feasible to count and
8 pay for work time to the minute. Accordingly, Defendants frequently paid Plaintiff and the
9 Aggrieved Employees less than all their work time. Some of this unpaid work also should have
10 been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Defendants also failed to
11 maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

12 20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully failed to include non-
13 discretionary bonuses, commissions, incentive pay, production pay, performance pay, and/or shift
14 differentials in the calculation of Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay used
15 to calculate their overtime rate for the payment of overtime wages. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
16 Employees earned non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, incentive pay, production pay,
17 performance pay, and/or shift differentials in the same pay periods where they worked overtime
18 hours. Accordingly, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for
19 all overtime compensation they were owed.

20 **B. Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

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

27 22. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff
28 and the Aggrieved Employees with their legally mandated 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free

1 meal period. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees routinely worked through meal periods “off-
2 the-clock,” and Defendants frequently paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees less than all
3 their work time. Much of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing
4 to pay for all hours worked, Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours
5 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked. Defendants also regularly, but not always,
6 required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day
7 without providing an uninterrupted and duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or
8 without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not
9 provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Instead, Defendants continued
10 to assert control over Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or
11 encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of
12 taking mandatory meal periods, or by denying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees permission
13 to take a meal period. Accordingly, Defendants’ policy and practice was not to provide meal
14 periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

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

19 **C. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods**

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

25 25. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
26 and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest periods.
27 Defendants regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four
28 consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute,

1 uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours),
2 or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not
3 authorized or permitted. Instead, Defendants continued to assert control over Plaintiff and the
4 Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which
5 could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods, or by denying
6 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a rest period. Accordingly, Defendants'
7 policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take
8 rest periods in compliance with California law.

9 26. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of
10 additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required
11 rest periods. Defendants, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
12 the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized
13 and permitted to take.

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

15 27. Based on its failure to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as
16 discussed above, Defendants also violated Labor Code § 204.

17 28. Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times
18 per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action,
19 employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period
20 premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for overtime hours
21 worked. However, during all such times, Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay the
22 employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not
23 paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendants, all wages for all rest periods not
24 authorized and permitted by Defendants, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result,
25 Defendants owe employees the legally required wages not paid, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
26 Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

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

28 29. Plaintiff seeks penalties under California Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to

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

6 30. Defendants, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all
7 meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

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

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

21 32. Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee,
22 the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if
23 an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and
24 payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-
25 two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled
26 to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

27 33. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many
28 other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e., was terminated by quitting or being discharged, and the

1 employment of others will be terminated. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants
2 failed, and continue to fail to pay Plaintiff and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without
3 abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of
4 discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employment. These
5 unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum wages, straight time wages,
6 overtime wages, rest and recovery periods, and other nonproductive time), missed meal period
7 premium wages, and missed rest period premium wages.

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

13 35. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from
14 Defendants their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular
15 hourly rate of pay, up to thirty (30) days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

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

17 36. Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her
18 employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information,
19 including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-
20 rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all
21 deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated
22 and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the
23 employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security
24 number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name
25 and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect
26 during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the
27 employee. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Labor Code
28 § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

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

7 38. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and the
8 Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly
9 rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages for
10 meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for
11 rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law).

12 39. Because Defendants violated Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and similarly
13 Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.
14 Accordingly, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from
15 Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants’ failure to comply with
16 Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000)
17 dollars per employee.

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

19 40. Labor Code § 2802(a) provides that employers shall indemnify his or her
20 employees for all necessary business expenditures or losses that have been incurred by the
21 employees in direct discharge of his or her duties. Throughout the statute of limitations period
22 applicable to this cause of action, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
23 Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants.
24 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees regularly paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-
25 related expenses, including, without limitation, work-related equipment, work attire, and use
26 of personal vehicles. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred substantial expenses as
27 a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendants, but Defendants failed to indemnify
28 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of**
3 **2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.)**

4 41. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges all preceding paragraphs as though
5 fully set forth herein.

6 42. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the
7 State of California and the applicable IWC Orders.

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

15 44. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor Code §
16 2699.3. On June 20, 2025, he gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development
17 Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that
18 Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and former Aggrieved Employees, including the
19 facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiff also paid the filing fee on June 20, 2025. Plaintiff’s
20 PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-1106619-25 (*Andres De Jesus Hernandez v. Wallcraft Drywall, Inc.*).

21 45. The statute of limitations is tolled while a plaintiff exhausts his or her
22 administrative remedies with California’s LWDA prior to suit, which is required by the statute.
23 (*See* Labor Code § 2699.3(d).)

24 46. Sixty-five (65) days has elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice, but the LWDA has not
25 indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’ Labor Code violations discussed in the notice.
26 Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant
27 to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but
28 are not limited to, penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

1 47. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiff is entitled to an award
2 of civil penalties on behalf of the State of California and similarly Aggrieved Employees of
3 Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount to be shown
4 according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted by law.

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

8 ///

9 ///

10 ///

11 ///

12 ///

13 ///

14 ///

15 ///

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 Plaintiff, on behalf of all similarly aggrieved employees, prays for relief and judgment
3 against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

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

10 2. An award of civil penalties on behalf of himself and all similarly aggrieved
11 employees pursuant to PAGA;

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

13 4. Attorneys' fees and costs reasonably incurred;


14 5. Injunctive and declaratory relief to the extent allowed by PAGA; and,

15 6. Such other and further relief that the Court deems proper.
16

17 Respectfully submitted,

18 Dated: August 25, 2025

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

19
20 By: 
21 John G. Yolas
22 Arrash T. Fattahi
Arman A. Salehi

23 Attorneys for Plaintiff
24
25
26
27
28