

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)  
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)  
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)  
Christina M. Le, Esq. (SBN 237697)  
Austin J. Reid, Esq. (SBN 351370)  
**LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP**  
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200  
Beverly Hills, California 90211  
Telephone: (310) 432-0000  
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001  
Email: [jlavi@lelawfirm.com](mailto:jlavi@lelawfirm.com)  
[vgranberry@lelawfirm.com](mailto:vgranberry@lelawfirm.com)  
[jklein@lelawfirm.com](mailto:jklein@lelawfirm.com)  
[cle@lelawfirm.com](mailto:cle@lelawfirm.com)  
[areid@lelawfirm.com](mailto:areid@lelawfirm.com)

ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
Superior Court of California,  
County of San Diego

9/9/2025 1:21:00 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court  
By M. Manneh, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff JORGE ALFONSO GUEVARA,  
on behalf of himself and current and former aggrieved employees

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

JORGE ALFONSO GUEVARA, on behalf of  
himself and current and former aggrieved  
employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

AMN SERVICES, LLC; and DOES 1 to 100,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 25CU047657C

**PAGA ACTION**

**PLAINTIFF JORGE ALFONSO  
GUEVARA'S COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

**COMES NOW** Plaintiff JORGE ALFONSO GUEVARA ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and  
complains against Defendants AMN SERVICES, LLC; 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 during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated with

Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all hours worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure to pay overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant meal periods or pay meal period premium wages; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or pay rest period premium wages; indemnification for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by employees in direct consequence of discharging their duties; statutory penalties for failure to timely pay earned wages during employment; statutory payment for secret payment of wages lower than designated by statute; statutory penalties for failure to establish, implement, and maintain a workplace violence and injury prevention program; statutory penalties for failure to provide accurate wage statements; statutory waiting time penalties in the form of continuation wages for failure to timely pay employees all wages due upon separation of employment. Plaintiff experienced these violations personally, as well as is informed and believes other aggrieved employees did as well. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

## **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout California, including but not limited to San Diego County, at 12400 High Bluff Drive, San Diego, CA 92130.

## **III. PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce

1 Development Agency on behalf of himself and other current and former employees subject to  
2 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is  
3 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work  
4 for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp  
5 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently  
6 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by  
7 Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in San Diego County, from in or around  
8 April 2021 until on or about March 20, 2025.

9         2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant AMN  
10 SERVICES, LLC is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business  
11 in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant hereto  
12 were persons acting on behalf of Defendant AMN SERVICES, LLC in the establishment of, or  
13 ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant AMN  
14 SERVICES, LLC operates in San Diego County, and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees  
15 in San Diego County, including but not limited to, at 12400 High Bluff Drive, San Diego, CA 92130.

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

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

27         5. 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 6. 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 Plaintiff  
7 reserves all of Plaintiff's right to plead in the alternative.

8 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**  
10 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

11 **(Against all Defendants by Plaintiff on behalf of Themselves, the State of California, and**  
12 **Other Current and Former Aggrieved Employees)**

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

14 8. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges  
15 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197,  
16 2802, 6401.7, 6401.9, and the applicable Wage Orders.

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

19 10. **Failure to pay wages for all hours worked at the legal minimum wage:**  
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 employee  
23 is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either directly or  
24 indirectly, performing services which inure to the benefit of the employer.

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

28 12. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly

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

6 (a) Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt  
7 employees who worked remotely were not paid for the time spent booting up computers and  
8 remotely setting up Defendants' computer systems prior to being able to clock in for the start of  
9 their shifts.

10 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly  
11 non-exempt employees to clock out for their meal breaks and continue to work through their off-  
12 the-clock meal breaks without being paid for that time.

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

19 14. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that  
20 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
21 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
22 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

23 15. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay**  
24 **and/or failure to pay overtime wages at the proper rate of pay:** Defendants employed many of  
25 their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt employees. In California, an employer  
26 is required to pay hourly employees for all "hours worked," which includes all time that an employee  
27 is under control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered and permitted to work. This  
28 includes the time an employee spends, either directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to

1 the benefit of the employer.’

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

5 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40) hours  
6 in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in  
7 any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-one-half  
8 (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve (12) hours  
9 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.

10 Labor Code section 510.

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

14 (a) Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt  
15 employees who worked remotely were not paid for the time spent booting up computers and  
16 remotely setting up Defendants’ computer systems prior to being able to clock in for the start of  
17 their shifts.

18 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly  
19 non-exempt employees to clock out for their meal breaks and continue to work through their off-  
20 the-clock meal breaks without being paid for that time.

21 18. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that  
22 Employer’s conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
23 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
24 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

25 19. The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each  
26 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt  
27 employees were under the control of Defendants but were not compensated. To the extent that the  
28 foregoing uncompensated time occurred when Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved

1 California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday,  
2 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendants failed  
3 to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code  
4 sections 510, 1194 and 1198, and the applicable Wage Order.

5       20.     **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**  
6 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant meal periods and/or failure to**  
7 **pay period premium wages:** Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
8 hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked shifts of more than five (5) hours in length and  
9 shifts of more than ten (10) hours in length.

10       21.     California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an  
11 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of  
12 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the  
13 employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 4 at §11;  
14 *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ  
15 an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee  
16 with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh  
17 hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period  
18 shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. A paid "on duty" meal  
19 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved  
20 of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

21       22.     If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the  
22 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay  
23 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code  
24 sections 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 4 at §11.

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

1 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly  
2 non-exempt employees to clock out for their meal breaks and continue to work through their off-  
3 the-clock meal breaks without being paid for that time.

4 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
5 hourly non-exempt employees a second uninterrupted duty-free meal period of no less than thirty  
6 (30) minutes for each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-  
7 based hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

8 (c) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
9 hourly non-exempt employees timely, uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes  
10 for every five hours worked, as a result of untimely meal breaks after the fifth hour of work.

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

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

20 26. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that  
21 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
22 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
23 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

24 27. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**  
25 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant rest periods and/or failure to pay**  
26 **rest period premium:** Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly  
27 non-exempt employees regularly worked shifts of more than three-and-a-half (3.5) hours.

28 28. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest

1 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor Code  
2 section 226.7; Wage Order 4 at §12. Under California law, “[e]mployees are entitled to 10 minutes’  
3 rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six  
4 hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on.” *Brinker*  
5 *Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code section 226.7;  
6 Wage Order 4 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each work period.  
7 Wage Order 4 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement ““obligates employers to permit –  
8 and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*  
9 (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all  
10 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

11         29. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer must  
12 pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday the  
13 employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7; Wage  
14 Order 4 at § 12.

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

19                 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
20 hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours worked  
21 or major fraction thereof.

22                 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
23 hourly non-exempt employees a third uninterrupted duty-free rest period of no less than ten (10) net  
24 minutes on each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
25 hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

26         31. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or  
27 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
28 hourly non-exempt employees with one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday

1 they did not receive legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor Code section  
2 226.7.

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

7 33. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that  
8 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
9 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
10 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

11 34. **Failure to Indemnify for Losses and Expenditures Incurred as Part of**  
12 **Employment:** California law requires that every employer must indemnify its employees for all  
13 necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in discharge of his or her duties or at the  
14 obedience of the directions of the employer. Moreover, an employer is prohibited from passing the  
15 ordinary business expenses and losses of the employer onto the employee. (Lab. Code, § 2802.)

16 35. Defendants have violated Labor Code Section 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiff  
17 and other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees' necessary  
18 expenditures they incurred in the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendants employed  
19 policies, practices, and/or procedures included, but not limited to:

20 (a) requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly  
21 non-exempt employees who work remotely to use or purchase their own tools and/or resources in  
22 order to work for Defendants, including but not limited to cellphone and internet usage for work-  
23 related purposes - without reimbursing Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-  
24 based hourly non-exempt employees for such use.

25 36. Moreover, Defendants employed policies and procedures which ensured Plaintiff and  
26 aggrieved employees would not receive indemnification for their employment related expenses.  
27 This practice resulted in Plaintiff and aggrieved employees not receiving such indemnification in  
28 compliance with California law.

1           37.     Therefore, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for their  
2 employment related expenses, including but not limited to costs related to use of their personal cell  
3 phones and costs associated with their uniforms pursuant to Labor Code section 2802.

4           38.     Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that  
5 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
6 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
7 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

24           41.     Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
25 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
26 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

27           42.     **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section  
28 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated

1 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage  
2 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by  
3 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful  
4 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,  
5 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor  
6 Code section 1198, the Defendant secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while  
7 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

8 43. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
9 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
10 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

11 44. **Failure to Implement a Workplace Violence Prevention Policy:** Labor Code  
12 Sections 6401.7 and 6401.9 require Defendants to develop and implement a workplace violence  
13 prevention plan in accordance with newly codified Labor code section 6401.9, which sets out the  
14 requirements for the plan. Starting July 1, 2024, Defendants were required to establish, implement,  
15 and maintain a Workplace Violence Prevention Plan that includes: 1) implementation of a  
16 Workplace Violence Prevention Plan; 2) maintaining a violence incidence log; 3) providing a  
17 training program to discuss a prevent workplace violence; and 4) maintain records relating to  
18 workplace violence which includes, records of workplace violence hazard identification,  
19 evaluations, and correction must be created and maintained for a minimum of five years; training  
20 records must be created and maintained; incident logs; and records of workplace violence incident  
21 investigations must be maintained.

22 45. Defendants willfully failed to implement a Workplace violence Prevention Policy  
23 starting on or about July 1, 2024. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover  
24 penalties up to \$25,000 for each serious violation, and up to \$124,709 (to be adjusted based on the  
25 Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers) for "willful violations." See Labor Code Sections  
26 6401.7, 6401.9 6428, and 6429.

27 46. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section  
28 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an employee

1 his or her wages, the employer must “furnish each of his or her employees ... an itemized statement  
2 in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any  
3 employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of  
4 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare  
5 Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee  
6 is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all deductions made on written orders  
7 of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive  
8 dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her  
9 social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all  
10 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours  
11 worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

12 47. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff  
13 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages  
14 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period  
15 premium wages) rendered Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
16 hourly non-exempt employees’ wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section  
17 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

18 48. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

19 49. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
20 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
21 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

26 51. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, because Defendants failed to pay  
27 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all  
28 their earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages,

1 and/or rest period premium wages), Defendants failed to pay those employees timely after each  
2 employee's termination and/or resignation, in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

3 52. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

4 53. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
5 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
6 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

11 55. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code  
12 section 2699.3. On June 17, 2025, *Plaintiff* filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and  
13 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of  
14 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the  
15 violations alleged.

16 56. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by  
17 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code  
18 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the  
19 parties notice within 60 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends  
20 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

21 57. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil  
22 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7,  
23 510, 512, 1194, 6401.7, and 6401.9, During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the  
24 present, preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in  
25 the following amounts:

26 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, and 2802;  
27 one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and  
28 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent

violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

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

c. For violations of Labor Code section 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50) for each employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 558].

d. For violations of Labor Code section 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 210].

e. For violations of Labor Code section 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 225.5].

f. For violations of Labor Code sections 6401.7 and 6401.9, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover penalties up to \$25,000 for each serious violation, and up to \$124,709 (to be adjusted based on the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers) for “willful violations.”

58. 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:**

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

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

4 2. For any and all legally applicable penalties during the relevant statute of limitations  
5 subject to any permissible tolling, including but not limited to those recoverable under the California  
6 Labor Code, including but not limited to sections 210, 225.5, 226.3, 558, 2699(f);

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

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

11  
12 Dated: September 9, 2025

Respectfully submitted,  
**LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP**

13  
14 By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph Lavi, Esq.  
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.  
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.  
Christina M. Le, Esq.  
Austin J. Reid, Esq.  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
JORGE ALFONSO GUEVARA,  
on behalf of himself and current and former  
aggrieved employees