

FILE BY FAX

FILED
Superior Court Of California,
Sacramento
04/12/2023
ybloxson
By..... Deputy
Case Number:
34-2023-00337837

Justin F. Marquez (SBN 262417)
justin@wilshirelawfirm.com
Christina M. Le (SBN 237697)
cle@wilshirelawfirm.com
Zachary D. Greenberg (SBN 331501)
zgreenberg@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90010
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

MARIA RODRIGUEZ, on behalf of the State of
California and other aggrieved persons,

Plaintiff,

v.

BP VENTURE MANAGEMENT, INC. DBA
LITTLE CAESARS PIZZA, a California
corporation; LITTLE CAESAR ENTERPRISES,
INC., a corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.:

**PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

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

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

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

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

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

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

1 period.

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

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

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

19 7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the
20 unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the
21 foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. Further,
22 Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under
23 the doctrine of "respondeat superior".

24 **THE PARTIES**

25 **A. Plaintiff**

26 8. Plaintiff Maria Rodriguez is a resident of Sacramento County, California, who
27 worked for Defendants in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately
28 October 2021 to approximately August 2022.

1 **B. Defendants**

2 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
3 alleges, that BP VENTURE MANAGEMENT, INC. DBA LITTLE CAESARS PIZZA and
4 LITTLE CAESAR ENTERPRISES, INC. are, and at all times herein mentioned, were:

5 (a) Business entities conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
6 State of California, including Sacramento County; and

7 (b) The former employer of Plaintiff and the current and/or former employer of
8 the Aggrieved Employees because Defendant BP VENTURE
9 MANAGEMENT, INC. DBA LITTLE CAESARS PIZZA and LITTLE
10 CAESAR ENTERPRISES, INC. suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the
11 Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or
12 working conditions.

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

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

23 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times each
24 Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and the
25 other employees and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff
26 is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the
27 principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary,
28 affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of

1 the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise
2 for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable
3 for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below. Plaintiff is informed and believes and
4 thereon alleges that each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships
5 alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have known about, and authorized, ratified,
6 adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

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

8 13. Plaintiff Maria Rodriguez worked for Defendants in Sacramento County, California
9 from approximately October 2021 to approximately August 2022. At all times, Defendants paid
10 Plaintiff an hourly wage and classified her as non-exempt from overtime.

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

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

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

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

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

27 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not
28 paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum, straight

1 time, and overtime wages. Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work
2 “off-the-clock”, uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
3 to perform work during legally required meals periods and after their work shifts ended. Some of
4 this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked,
5 Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
6 Employees worked.

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

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

14 20. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff
15 and the Aggrieved Employees with their legally mandated 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free
16 meal period. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees routinely worked through meal periods “off-
17 the-clock,” and Defendants frequently paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees less than all
18 their work time. Much of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing
19 to pay for all hours worked, Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours
20 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked. Defendants also regularly, but not always,
21 required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day
22 without providing a 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period for every five hours of
23 work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were
24 not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Instead, Defendants
25 continued to assert control over Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring,
26 or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu
27 of taking mandatory meal periods, or by denying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
28 permission to take a meal period. Defendants also never informed Plaintiff of her right to, nor

1 permitted her to take, a second meal period when Plaintiff worked at least ten hours of work in a
2 workday. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was not to provide meal periods to
3 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

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

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

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

14 23. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully failed to authorize and
15 permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest periods. Defendants
16 regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive
17 hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute,
18 uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours),
19 or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not
20 authorized or permitted. Instead, Defendants continued to assert control over Plaintiff and the
21 Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which
22 could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods, or by denying
23 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a rest period. Accordingly, Defendants'
24 policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take
25 rest periods in compliance with California law.

26 24. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of
27 additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required
28 rest periods. Defendants, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees

1 the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized
2 and permitted to take.

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

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

6 26. Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times
7 per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action,
8 employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period
9 premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for overtime hours
10 worked. However, during all such times, Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay the
11 employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not
12 paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendants, all wages for all rest periods not
13 authorized and permitted by Defendants, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result,
14 Defendants owe employees the legally required wages not paid, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
15 Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

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

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

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

25 29. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records required by the California
26 Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the
27 ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the
28 accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendants' records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the

1 Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which
2 resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the
3 Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use
4 and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in
5 seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective
6 damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendants' knowing failure to
7 comply with the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the
8 Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing,
9 understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

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

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

17 31. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many
18 other Aggrieved Employees ended, *i.e.*, was terminated by quitting or being discharged, and the
19 employment of others will be terminated. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants
20 failed, and continue to fail to pay Plaintiff and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without
21 abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of
22 discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employment. These
23 unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum wages, straight time wages,
24 overtime wages, rest and recovery periods, and other nonproductive time), missed meal period
25 premium wages, and missed rest period premium wages.

26 32. Defendants' conduct violates Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Labor Code § 203
27 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201
28 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and

1 at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced, but the wages shall not continue for
2 more than thirty (30) days.

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

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

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

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

25 36. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and the
26 Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates,
27 and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages for meal periods
28 that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for rest periods that

1 were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law).

2 37. Because Defendants violated Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved
3 Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights. Accordingly, Plaintiff
4 and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their
5 actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate
6 penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000) dollars per employee.

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

8 38. Labor Code § 2802(a) provides that employers shall indemnify his or her employees
9 for all necessary business expenditures or losses that have been incurred by the employees in direct
10 discharge of his or her duties. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause
11 of action, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses
12 that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
13 Employees regularly paid out-of-pocket for necessary business expenses, including, without
14 limitation, use of personal cell phones. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred substantial
15 expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendants, but Defendants failed to
16 indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

17 **I. Failure To Produce Requested Employment Records**

18 39. Labor Code § 226(c) provides that every employer who receives a written or oral
19 request to inspect or receive a copy of records pursuant to subdivision (a) and (b) pertaining to a
20 current or former employee shall comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than
21 21 calendar days from the date of the request. A violation of this subdivision is an infraction.
22 Impossibility of performance, not caused by or a result of a violation of law, shall be an affirmative
23 defense for an employer in any action alleging a violation of this subdivision. An employer may
24 designate the person to whom a request under this subdivision will be made.

25 40. Labor Code § 1198.5 provides that (a) Every current and former employee, or his
26 or her representative, has the right to inspect and receive a copy of the personnel records that the
27 employer maintains relating to the employee's performance or to any grievance concerning the
28 employee. (b)(1) The employer shall make the contents of those personnel records available for

1 inspection to the current or former employee, or his or her representative, at reasonable intervals
2 and at reasonable times, but not later than 30 calendar days from the date the employer receives a
3 written request, unless the current or former employee, or his or her representative, and the
4 employer agree in writing to a date beyond 30 calendar days to inspect the records, and the agreed-
5 upon date does not exceed 35 calendar days from the employer's receipt of the written request.
6 Upon a written request from a current or former employee, or his or her representative, the
7 employer shall also provide a copy of the personnel records, at a charge not to exceed the actual
8 cost of reproduction, not later than 30 calendar days from the date the employer receives the
9 request, unless the current or former employee, or his or her representative, and the employer agree
10 in writing to a date beyond 30 calendar days to produce a copy of the records, as long as the agreed-
11 upon date does not exceed 35 calendar days from the employer's receipt of the written request.
12 Except as provided in paragraph (2) of subdivision (c), the employer is not required to make those
13 personnel records or a copy thereof available at a time when the employee is actually required to
14 render service to the employer, if the requester is the employee.

15 41. On May 6, 2022, and August 4, 2022, Plaintiff sent requests through her counsel to
16 Defendants for her personnel file, pay records, wage statements, timekeeping records, and other
17 employment-related documents pursuant to Labor Code section 226 and 1198.5. However,
18 Defendants failed to timely produce the requested employment records, in violation of Labor Code
19 sections 226 and 1198.5. Defendants have not produced any of the requested employment records
20 for Plaintiff as of the date of this Complaint.

21 42. As a result, Defendant is liable for to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the
22 civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5 for failing to produce requested
23 employment records.

24 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of**
26 **2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.)**

27 43. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges all preceding paragraphs as though
28 fully set forth herein.

1 44. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the
2 State of California and the applicable IWC Orders.

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

10 46. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor
11 Code § 2699.3. On December 8, 2022, she gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and
12 Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific
13 provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and former
14 Aggrieved Employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiff also paid
15 the filing fee on December 8, 2022. Plaintiff’s PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-923515-22
16 (*Maria Rodriguez v. BP Venture Management, Inc.*). On January 24, 2023, she gave her amended
17 written notice by online filing to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific
18 provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and former
19 Aggrieved Employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations.

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

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

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

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

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

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

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

4. Attorneys' fees and costs reasonably incurred;

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 12, 2023

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

By:

Justin F. Marquez
Christina M. Le
Zachary D. Greenberg

Attorneys for Plaintiff