

Zorik Mooradian, Esq., CSB No. 136636
 zorik@mooradianlaw.com
 Haik Hacopian, Esq., CSB No. 282361
 haik@mooradianlaw.com
 MOORADIAN LAW, APC
 24007 Ventura Blvd., Suite 210
 Calabasas, CA 91302
 Telephone: (818) 487-1998
 Facsimile: (888) 783-1030

FILED
 Superior Court of California
 County of Los Angeles
09/19/2025

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
 By: R. Lozano Deputy

Attorneys for: Plaintiff GABRIELA ORTIZ CRESPO, individually and on behalf
 of other persons similarly situated and similarly aggrieved
 employees

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE**

GABRIELA ORTIZ CRESPO, individually and
 on behalf of other persons similarly situated
 and similarly aggrieved employees,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MS RESTAURANT MANAGEMENT, INC.,
 an active California Corporation; and DOES 1
 through 10,

Defendants.

Case No.: 25STCV16155

Assigned to: *Hon. David S.
 Cunningham*

Department: *SS-11*

Complaint Filed: *June 3, 2025*

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT –
 CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE
 ACTION
 JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

1. Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
2. Failure to Provide Paid Rest
Periods;
3. Failure to Pay Wages;
4. Failure to Timely Pay Wages at
Termination/Separation;
5. Failure to Timely Pay Vacation
Wages at Termination;
6. Failure to Provide Accurate Wage
Statements;

7. Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses; and
8. Violation of Unfair Business Practices Act – Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and
9. Penalties Pursuant to Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”)

Plaintiff GABRIELA ORTIZ CRESPO (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, based on information and belief, complains and alleges:

I.

INTRODUCTION

1. This class and representative action lawsuit arises out of the failure of Defendant MS RESTAURANT MANAGEMENT, INC. (referred here as “MS” or “Defendant”) to provide meal periods at the proper intervals, to provide rest periods at the proper intervals, to pay all wages owed including overtime, to provide accurate wage statements, to pay all wages owed to terminated or separated employees in a timely manner, to pay all vacation pay owed to terminated or separated employees, and to reimburse employee business expenses.
2. Defendant employed Plaintiff during the applicable time period, utilizing consistent policies and procedures in violation of Labor Code §200, *et seq.*, Labor Code §500, *et seq.*, Labor Code §1194, *et seq.*, Labor Code §2800, *et seq.*, and the applicable Wage Orders issued by the California Industrial Welfare Commission.
3. Defendant is engaged in the business of operating fast food restaurants. Plaintiff was hired around February 2021 and separated on or about April 17, 2025. At all times during said employment, Plaintiff had a non-exempt classification. Plaintiff was working at the McDonald’s restaurant located at 27618 Old Road in Valencia, California 91355.

- 1 4. At the time of her separation, Plaintiff was not paid all her wages, including all
2 accrued and vested vacation pay.
- 3 5. Plaintiff was also deprived of lawful meal and rest periods, not paid all wages
4 she was entitled to, and failed to receive accurate and compliant itemized wage
5 statements.
- 6 6. Defendant had a consistent policy of not paying wages for all hours worked,
7 including overtime and double time wages to the extent applicable, including
8 failing to calculate overtime and double time with respect to an employee's
9 regular rate of compensation.
- 10 7. Defendant had a consistent policy of requiring its employees, including
11 Plaintiff, to work through meal periods or work without a meal period for at
12 least five (5) hours of a shift and failing to pay such employees one (1) hour of
13 pay at the employees' regular rate of compensation for each workday that the
14 meal period was not provided or as required by California state wage and hour
15 laws.
- 16 8. Defendant had a consistent policy of failing to allow its employees, including
17 Plaintiff, rest periods for at least ten (10) minutes per four (4) hours, or a major
18 fraction worked, and failing to pay such employees one (1) hour of pay at their
19 regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period was not
20 provided, or other compensation, as required by California state and wage and
21 hour laws.
- 22 9. Defendant knowingly provided inaccurate wage statements to its
23 employees, including Plaintiff, that did not correctly include the correct wages,
24 including compensation for meal periods not provided and rest period not
25 authorized or permitted as required by California state wage and hour laws.
- 26 10. Defendant had a consistent policy of failing to pay its employees, including
27 Plaintiff, all wages including unpaid premium wages and accrued and vested
28

1 vacation pay, due at the termination or separation, in violation of California
2 state wage and hour laws.

3 11. Defendants had a consistent policy of failing to reimburse their employees,
4 including Plaintiff, for all business expenses incurred in the discharge of their
5 duties.

6 12. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all Class Members, brings this action
7 pursuant to Lab. Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 1194,
8 1194.2, 2800, and 2802 seeking unpaid wages, penalties, equitable relief, and
9 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

10 13. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the putative class members, also brings
11 this action pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, seeking injunctive
12 relief, restitution, and disgorgement of all benefits obtained by Defendant as a
13 result of Labor Code and applicable Wage Order violations.

14 14. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California, herself, and other similarly
15 aggrieved employees, also brings this action pursuant to California Private
16 Attorney General Act ("PAGA"), Cal. Lab. Code §2698, *et seq.* seeking unpaid
17 wages and other compensation, penalties, and reasonable attorneys' fees and
18 costs

19 II.

20 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

21 15. Venue as to as to each defendant is proper in this judicial district, pursuant to
22 Code of Civil Procedure § 395. The County of Los Angeles is the proper venue,
23 because work for Defendant was performed by Plaintiff and other class
24 members in the County of Los Angeles and the legal obligations owed by
25 Defendant to Plaintiff and other class members were breached in the County of
26 Los Angeles.

1 16. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction in this matter, because Plaintiff is
2 a resident of California, Defendant is qualified to do business in California and
3 regularly conducts business in California.

4 **III.**

5 **THE PARTIES**

6 17. Plaintiff GABRIELA ORTIZ CRESPO is a resident of the State of California, and
7 was employed by Defendant in Los Angeles County from on or about February
8 2021 through on or about April 17, 2025.

9 18. Defendant MS RESTAURANT MANAGEMENT, INC. was an active California
10 Corporation Corporation at all times during the claims of Plaintiff and the
11 putative class and was doing business in California.

12 19. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships and extent of
13 participation in the conduct herein alleged, of the defendants sued herein as
14 Does 1 through 10, but she is informed and believes and thereon alleges that
15 said defendants are legally responsible for the wrongful conduct alleged herein
16 and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names under Code of
17 Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff will amend this First Amended Complaint to
18 allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.

19 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted
20 in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants,
21 carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent
22 hereto, and the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other
23 Defendants.

24 **IV.**

25 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

26 21. At all times relevant here and as set forth in the following paragraphs of this
27 First Amended Complaint, Defendant employed more than 100 people; and
28

1 Plaintiff and each member of the putative class was employed by Defendant,
2 and each of them, in the State of California.

- 3 22. The employees of Defendant have not been provided: uninterrupted thirty-
4 minute meal periods for work periods of more than five (5) hours per day;
5 second uninterrupted thirty-minute meal periods for work periods of more
6 than ten (10) hours per day; and have not been permitted to take ten-minute
7 (10) rest periods for work periods of four (4) hours or major fractions, pursuant
8 to the Labor Code, and applicable IWC Wage Orders.
- 9 23. Defendant failed to pay employees wages owed for all hours worked, including
10 overtime and double time hours as applicable, as well as failing to calculate any
11 overtime wages with respect to an employee's regular rate of compensation.
- 12 24. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and the members of her putative class upon
13 separation the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, including
14 unpaid premium wages and accrued and vested vacation pay or "PTO."
- 15 25. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and the putative members of her class, at
16 the time of each payment of wages, an accurate itemized statement in writing,
17 showing the gross wages earned and/or paid, including premium wages owed
18 for failing to provide meal and/or rest periods at the proper intervals.
- 19 26. Defendants failed to fully reimburse Plaintiff and putative members of her class
20 for all their business-related expenditures. In violation of the Labor Code,
21 Plaintiff and putative members of her class did not receive indemnification for
22 all business-related expenditures.
- 23 27. Plaintiff asserts claims for relief on behalf of herself and other similarly situated
24 persons as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382. Plaintiff
25 and all members of her putative class are described below with specificity and
26 fall in several categories of subclasses whose rights have been violated under
27 the law. Defendant has made no effort as of the filing of this First Amended
28 Complaint to correct or remedy the violations of law specified here.

V.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

28. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all other employees of MS who are similarly-situated persons as a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. There is a well-defined common interest by and among Plaintiff and the putative class members, and it is impractical to bring all those individuals before the court under separate, different and repetitive actions. Plaintiff also reserves the right to amend or modify the class descriptions set forth below in greater specificity or clarity if required in the future in accordance with Rule 3.765 (b), California Rules of Court. The class which Plaintiff seeks to represent is composed of and defined as follows:

“Plaintiff Class” – All of Defendant’s current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in California, during the four years before the filing of the Complaint through the time of class certification.

29. Plaintiff seeks to certify the following subclasses of employees:

- a) “Meal Period Subclass” – All members of Plaintiff Class who worked each period exceeding five (5) hours without an uninterrupted, off duty, thirty (30) minute meal period and/or periods in excess of ten (10) hours without a second uninterrupted, off duty, thirty (30) minute meal periods; and were not provided compensation of one hour’s pay at the employee’s regular rate for each day that a meal period was not provided.
- b) “Rest Period Subclass” – All members of Plaintiff Class who worked periods of four (4) hours or major fraction thereof without a duty free rest period of at least 10-minutes and who were not compensated one hour’s pay at the employee’s regular rate for each day that a rest period was not permitted.

- 1 c) "Unpaid Wage Subclass" – All members of Plaintiff Class who were
2 not paid their minimum/actual wages, including any time that was
3 unlawfully rounded by Defendant or otherwise considered as off-the-
4 clock, as well as overtime wages for hours worked in excess of eight
5 hours per day at the one and a half rate (of an employee's regular rate
6 of pay) or at a double time rate (of an employee's regular rate of pay)
7 as applicable.
- 8 d) "Waiting Time Subclass" – All members of Plaintiff Class to whom
9 Defendant failed to pay all wages due to them upon termination or
10 resignation under Labor Code §§ 201-203.
- 11 e) "Vacation Pay Subclass" – All members of Plaintiff Class to whom
12 Defendant failed to pay all vacation wages owed, vested or agreed to
13 upon termination or resignation as required by Labor Code §227.3.
- 14 f) "Wage Statement Subclass" – All members of Plaintiff Class to whom
15 Defendant improperly failed to provide accurate itemized wage
16 statements under Labor Code §§ 226.
- 17 g) "Expense Reimbursement Subclass" – All members of Plaintiff Class to
18 whom Defendants failed to fully reimburse employee business
19 expenses as required by Labor Code §2802.
- 20 h) "UCL Subclass" – All members of the Meal Period, Rest Period,
21 Unpaid Wage, Waiting Time, Vacation Pay, Wage Statement, and
22 Expense Reimbursement Subclasses who were subject to unlawful,
23 illegal, unfair and/or deceptive business acts and practices by
24 Defendant and are entitled to disgorgement and restitution of unpaid
25 wages.

26 30. There is a well-defined community of interest among many persons who
27 comprise a readily ascertainable class:
28

- 1 a) Numerosity - The potential members of the Class and Subclasses as
2 defined here are so numerous that the individual joinder of all of them as
3 named plaintiffs is impracticable. The number of members of the Class
4 and Subclasses is unknown to Plaintiff. It is however estimated that the
5 members are more than 100 individuals, and their identities may readily
6 be ascertained from Defendant's records.
- 7 b) Typicality – The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of all
8 members of the Class and Subclasses, who sustained similar damages
9 arising out of Defendant's common course of conduct in violation of law
10 as alleged.
- 11 c) Ascertainable Class – The proposed Class and Subclasses are
12 ascertainable as the members can readily be identified and located based
13 on the Defendant's payroll and personnel records.
- 14 d) Adequacy – Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the Class and
15 Subclasses: Plaintiff will fairly protect the interests of the members, she
16 has no interest adverse to the members, and she will vigorously pursue
17 this lawsuit on behalf of all the members of the Class and Subclasses.
18 Plaintiff's attorneys are competent, skilled and experienced in litigating
19 large employment law class actions.
- 20 e) Superiority - Class action treatment will allow a large number of
21 similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single
22 forum simultaneously, efficiently, and without the unnecessary
23 duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions
24 would require. Further, the monetary amounts due to many individual
25 members of the Class and Subclasses are likely to be relatively small, and
26 the burden and expense of individual litigation would make it difficult
27 or impossible for the members to seek and obtain relief. A class action
28 will serve an important public interest by permitting employees harmed

1 by Defendant's unlawful practices to effectively pursue recovery of the
2 sums owed to them.

- 3 f) Common Questions of Law and Fact – There are common questions of
4 law and fact as to the members of the Class and Subclasses which are
5 superior to questions affecting only individual members of the Class and
6 Subclasses. The common questions of law and fact may be summarized
7 as follows and if necessary will be refined with the progress of formal
8 discovery in the case:
- 9 g) Whether Defendant failed to provide members of Plaintiff Class who
10 ceased employment with Defendant all wages owed at the time of the
11 cessation of the employee-employer relationship?
- 12 h) Whether Defendant violated California law and applicable Wage Orders
13 by failing to provide Plaintiff Class members with paid ten-minute (10)
14 rest periods for each four hours worked?
- 15 i) Whether the remedy for an employer's failure to provide rest breaks as
16 required by law is a premium wage for hardship of missing a lawful rest
17 break?
- 18 j) Whether Defendant violated California law and applicable Wage Orders
19 by failing to provide Plaintiff Class members with thirty minute (30)
20 meal period for more than five hours of work?
- 21 k) Whether Defendant violated California law and applicable Wage Orders
22 by failing to provide members of Plaintiff Class with a second meal
23 period?
- 24 l) Whether the remedy for an employer's failure to provide meal period as
25 required by law is a premium wage for hardship of missing a lawful
26 meal period?
- 27 m) Whether Defendant violated California law, including the applicable
28 wage orders by failing to properly compensate Plaintiff Class members

for all hours worked, including overtime and double time hours as applicable?

- n) Whether Plaintiff Class is entitled to waiting time penalties under Labor Code § 203?
- o) Whether Defendant violated Labor Code §227.3 by its failure to provide Plaintiff Class with all vacation wages or PTO owed, vested or agreed to upon termination or separation?
- p) Whether Defendant violated California law by its failure to provide Plaintiff Class with accurate and itemized wage statements?
- q) Whether Defendants have violated Labor Code §2802 by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class for all business expenses incurred by them in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties?
- r) Whether Defendant violated Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 et. seq., Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 212, 213, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 1194, 1194.2, 2800, 2802, and applicable Wage Orders which constitute violations of the public policy?
- s) Whether Plaintiff Class is entitled to an equitable relief in accordance with Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 et. seq.
- t) Whether Defendant's affirmative defenses, if any, raise common issues of law and fact as to Plaintiff Class as a whole and/or Subclasses in particular?

VI.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIOD OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU THEREOF

(Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512)

(By Plaintiff and Meal Period Subclass against Defendant)

31. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 30 of this First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

1 32. By its failure to provide thirty minute (30) uninterrupted meal period as well as
2 second meal period, if applicable, to Plaintiff and members of Meal Period
3 Subclass, Defendant willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code §§ 226.7,
4 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders.

5 33. As a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and other members of the
6 Subclass have suffered damages as articulated in the Prayer for Relief, set forth
7 below, and fully incorporated here as applicable.

8 **VII.**

9 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
10 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS OR**
11 **COMPENSATION IN LIEU THEREOF**

12 **(Labor Code § 226.7)**

13 **(By Plaintiff and Rest Period Subclass against Defendant)**

14 34. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 30 of this First Amended Complaint
15 as if fully alleged herein.

16 35. By its failure to provide ten-minute (10) rest periods for every four (4) hours of
17 work or major fraction thereof per day to Plaintiff and Rest Period Subclass,
18 Defendant willfully violated Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders.

19 36. As a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and other members of the
20 Subclass have suffered damages as articulated in the Prayer for Relief, set forth
21 below, and fully incorporated here as applicable.

22 **VIII.**

23 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**
24 **FAILURE TO PAY WAGES**

25 **(Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 1194, 1194.2)**

26 **(By Plaintiff and the Unpaid Wage Subclass against Defendant)**

27 37. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 30 of this First Amended Complaint
28 as if fully alleged herein.

1 38. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the other members of the Unpaid Wage Class
2 were employees of Defendant covered by Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 1194,
3 1194.2 and applicable Wage Orders, and they were entitled to receive minimum
4 and overtime wages for all hours worked and liquidated damages equal to
5 unlawfully unpaid minimum wages with interest.

6 39. Defendant has violated California law and the specified provisions of the Labor
7 Code and applicable Wage Orders by its failure to pay all wages due in
8 accordance, including minimum wages, wrongfully classified off-the-clock
9 wages, overtime pay and double time pay as based on an employee's regular
10 rate of compensation. Notably, any wages that were paid were not effectively
11 paid within seven (7) days of the close of any applicable payroll period. As a
12 result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and other members of the
13 Subclass have suffered damages as articulated in the Prayer for Relief, set forth
14 below, and fully incorporated here as applicable.

15 **IX.**

16 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **FAILURE TO PAY WAGES DUE AT TERMINATION**

18 **(Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203)**

19 **(By Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass against Defendant)**

20 40. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 30 of this First Amended Complaint
21 as if fully alleged herein.

22 41. By its failure to timely pay Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass, Defendant
23 willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203 and applicable
24 Wage Orders. Sec. 203 of Labor Code provides that if an employer willfully fails
25 to timely pay such wages, the employer must, as penalty, continue to pay the
26 employee's wages until the back wages are paid in full or an action is
27 commenced.
28

1 42. As a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and other members of the
2 Subclass have suffered damages as articulated in the Prayer for Relief, set forth
3 below, and fully incorporated here as applicable.

4 X.

5 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
6 **FAILURE TO PAY VACATION WAGES DUE AT TERMINATION**
7 **(Labor Code §227.3)**
8 **(By Plaintiff and Vacation Pay Subclass against Defendant)**

9 43. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 30 of this First Amended Complaint
10 as if fully alleged herein.

11 44. By its failure to timely pay Plaintiff and Vacation Pay Subclass, Defendant
12 willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code §227.3. Section 227.3 of Labor
13 Code provides that whenever a contract of employment or employer policy
14 provides for paid vacation, and an employee is terminated without having
15 taken off his or her vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to
16 him as wages at his or her final rate in accordance with such contract of
17 employment or employer policy respecting eligibility of time served; provided,
18 however, that an employment contract or employer policy shall not provide for
19 forfeiture of vested vacation time upon termination.

20 45. As a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and other members of the
21 Subclass have suffered damages as articulated in the Prayer for Relief, set forth
22 below, and fully incorporated here as applicable.

23 XI.

24 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
25 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**
26 **(Labor Code §226)**
27 **(By Plaintiff and Wage Statement Subclass against Defendant)**

28 46. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 30 of this First Amended Complaint
as if fully alleged herein.

1 47. By its failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, semimonthly or at
2 the time of each payment of wages, Defendant willfully violated the provisions
3 of Labor Code §226 and applicable Wage Orders.

4 48. As a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and other members of the
5 Subclass have suffered damages as articulated in the Prayer for Relief, set forth
6 below, and fully incorporated here as applicable.

7 **XII.**

8 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
9 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE ALL BUSINESS EXPENSES**
10 **(Labor Code §§2800, 2802)**
11 **(By Plaintiff and Expense Reimbursement Subclass against Defendants)**

12 49. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 30 of this First Amended Complaint
13 as if fully alleged herein.

14 50. Labor Code § 2800 provides, in pertinent part, "[a]n employer shall in all cases
15 indemnify his employee for losses caused by the employer's want of ordinary
16 care."

17 51. Labor Code § 2802 provides, in pertinent part, "[a]n employer shall indemnify
18 his or his her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the
19 employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties..."

20 52. Further, Labor Code § 2802 additionally provides, in pertinent part: "(c)...the
21 term 'necessary expenditures or losses' shall include all reasonable costs,
22 including but not limited to, attorney's fees incurred by the employee enforcing
23 the rights granted by this section."

24 53. During the relevant time period, Defendants were required to reimburse
25 Plaintiff and class members for all expenditures or losses caused by the
26 employer's want of ordinary care and/or incurred in direct consequence of the
27 discharge of their duties, but failed to indemnify and reimburse Plaintiff and
28 class members in violation of Labor Codes §§ 2800 and 2802.

1 54. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiff and class members have suffered, and
2 continue to suffer, substantial losses, related to the use and enjoyment of such
3 monies to be reimbursed, lost interest on such monies, and expenses and
4 attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform their
5 obligations under California law, all of their damage in amounts according to
6 proof at the time of trial.

7 **XIII.**

8 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
9 **VIOLATION OF UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES ACT**
10 **(Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)**
11 **(By Plaintiff, Plaintiff Class and All Subclasses against Defendant)**

12 55. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 54 of this First Amended Complaint
13 as if fully alleged herein.

14 56. The alleged unlawful conduct of Defendant constitutes unfair competition
15 pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*, and this cause of
16 action is brought as a cumulative remedy under Bus. & Prof. Code § 17205 for
17 the time period starting four (4) years before the filing of the Complaint.

18 57. As a result, Plaintiff and other members of Plaintiff Class and Subclasses have
19 suffered injury in fact and lost money or property. Plaintiff and said members
20 have been deprived of their rights as set forth in this First Amended Complaint,
21 including, but not limited to, payment of minimum and/or actual wages for all
22 hours worked.

23 58. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17203, Plaintiff and other
24 members of Plaintiff Class and Subclasses are entitled to restitution of all wages
25 owed to them under the Labor Code, and interest thereon, in which they had a
26 property interest, which Defendant failed to pay to them but withheld and
27 retained for itself. Restitution of the money owed to Plaintiff, Plaintiff Class and
28 Subclasses is necessary to prevent Defendant from becoming unjustly enriched
by its failure to comply with the Labor Code provisions.

1 59. Plaintiff and members of Plaintiff Class and Subclasses are entitled to recover
2 reasonable attorney's fees in connection with their unfair competition claims
3 pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine
4 and/or the common fund doctrine.

5 60. Plaintiff requests the court to issue a preliminary and permanent injunction
6 prohibiting defendants from committing the Labor Code and applicable Wage
7 Order violations set forth in this First Amended Complaint, and Plaintiff and
8 the members of Plaintiff Class and Subclasses have suffered further damages as
9 articulated in the Prayer for Relief, set forth below, also incorporated here fully
10 as applicable.

11 **XIV.**

12 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL ACT**

14 **(LABOR CODE § 2699 *et seq.*)**

15 **(By Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees Against Defendant)**

16 61. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 60 of this First Amended Complaint
17 as if fully alleged herein.

18 62. Under the Private Attorney General Act, Labor Code §§ 2698-99 ("PAGA"),
19 private parties may recover civil penalties for violations of the California Labor
20 Code. PAGA penalties are in addition to any other relief available under the
21 Labor Code.

22 63. As set forth above, Defendant violated the California Labor Code by
23 consistently failing to employ Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees
24 in compliance with California law.

25 64. Plaintiff provided written notice by certified mail to Defendants on June 3, 2025,
26 and electronic notice to the State Labor & Workforce Development Agency
27 ("LWDA"), of the legal claims and theories of this case. To date, and after 65
28 days from the date of mailing of notice, the LWDA has not notified Plaintiff that

1 the LWDA intends to exercise jurisdiction over the claim for civil penalties
2 under the PAGA. Accordingly, Plaintiff exhausted administrative remedies as
3 required by Labor Code § 2699.3. Plaintiff's PAGA claim was assigned case
4 number LWDA-CM-1102787-25 by the LWDA. Appended hereto is a copy of
5 the notice communicated by Plaintiff.

6 65. Under the PAGA, Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees are entitled to
7 recover the maximum civil penalties permitted by law from Defendant for the
8 violations of Labor Code alleged in this First Amended Complaint and the
9 notice communicated by Plaintiff.

10 66. Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees are also entitled to recover their
11 attorneys' fees and costs under Labor Code § 2699
12

13 XV.

14 PRAYER FOR RELIEF

15 **WHEREFORE**, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff
16 prays for relief and judgment against Defendant as follows:

17 A. An order certifying that Plaintiff may pursue her claims as a class action
18 under Section 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure; and it is further requested that
19 Plaintiff Class and each Plaintiff Subclass be certified;

20 B. An order appointing Plaintiff as Class representative;

21 C. An order appointing Plaintiff's counsel as Class counsel;

22 D. Disgorgement of Defendant's wrongfully obtained profits and restitution
23 of unpaid wages under Business and Professions Code §§ 17203, 17204;

24 E. Damages for unpaid additional compensation for failing to provide
25 timely or uninterrupted or lawful meal periods and rest periods;

26 F. Damages for unpaid minimum and overtime wages under Labor Code
27 §§ 1194 and 510;

28 G. Liquidated damages under Labor Code § 1194.2;

H. Statutory penalties under Labor Code § 226(e);

- 1 I. Damages for unpaid penalty wages under Labor Code § 203;
2 J. Reimbursement of business expenses under Labor Code § 2802;
3 K. Damages for unpaid vacation wages at the time of discharge under
4 Labor Code § 227.3;
5 L. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to statute, including, but
6 not limited to Labor Code § 218.5 and Code of Civ. Proc. § 1021.5;
7 M. Enjoinment of Defendant from further acts of unfair competition and
8 continuous violations of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders;
9 N. Civil penalties under Labor Code Section 2699 (75% payable to the
10 LWDA and 25% payable to aggrieved employees); and
11 O. For such other relief that the Court may deem just and proper, including
12 prejudgment interest and costs.

13
14 DATED: Sep. 19, 2025

MOORADIAN LAW, APC

15
16 By: /s/Haik Hacopian

17 **Zorik Mooradian,**

18 **Haik Hacopian,**

19 Attorneys for Plaintiff and the putative class

20 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

21 Plaintiff GABRIELA ORTIZ CRESPO hereby demands a jury trial in the above
22 case.
23

24 DATED: Sep. 19, 2025

MOORADIAN LAW, APC

25
26 By: /s/Haik Hacopian

27 **Zorik Mooradian,**

28 **Haik Hacopian,**

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the putative class