

October 27, 2025

VIA ON-LINE SUBMISSION ONLY TO:
(copy by certified mail to all Defendants)

Private Attorneys General Act
Attn. PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Denise M. Guzman- Agent for Service of Process
Premier Infusion and Healthcare Services, Inc.
111 N Sepulveda, STE 250-22
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5845 9927 60

Premier Infusion & Healthcare Services
19500 Normandie Ave.
Torrance CA 90502
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5845 9926 85

Premier Infusion Care
19500 Normandie Ave.
Torrance CA 90502
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5845 9921 04

**Re: Labor Code § 2698, et seq. Penalties – Amended PAGA Notice Letter to the LWDA
(Original Date July 24, 2025) LWDA Case No. CM-1114191-25
*Jaime Hernandez and Eugina Inez Williams v. Premier Infusion and Healthcare
Services, Inc. et al.*
*Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles (Case No. 25STCV21888)***

Gentlepersons:

This office represents Plaintiffs Jaime Hernandez (“Hernandez”) and Eugenia Inez Williams (“Williams”) (“collectively Plaintiffs”) and other similarly situated aggrieved non-exempt, hourly employees aggrieved employees (collectively “Aggrieved Employees”) for violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.6, 226, 226.7, 248.1, 248.2, 248.5, 245, 246 351, 354, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2802, 2810.5, 2698, and 2699, et seq.; provisions of the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) Wage Order(s); and California Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq.

The purpose of this amended PAGA notice is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 et. seq. (“the Act”) and to supplement and amend Plaintiff Hernandez’s original PAGA Notice Letter to the LWDA, submitted July 24, 2025 (LWDA Case No. CM-1114191-25), to add Plaintiff Williams as an additional representative in connection with the representative action, pursuant to the Act, on behalf of herself and all other



similarly situated Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, against Defendants Premier Infusion and Healthcare Services, Inc., a California corporation; Premier Infusion & Healthcare Services, an entity of unknown form; Premier Infusion Care, an entity of unknown form; and DOES 1 through 50 inclusive (all defendants being referred to herein collectively as “Defendants”).

Additionally, this correspondence will serve to satisfy the notice requirements under the Act, along with a copy of Plaintiff Hernandez’ original Class Action Complaint filed on July 24, 2025 in Los Angeles County (Case No. 25STCV21888), the First Amended Complaint adding Hernandez’ PAGA claims was filed on September 29, 2025, and the Second Amended Complaint that will be filed therein adding Plaintiff Williams and her claims, including those under the PAGA when the notice period has run. The original Complaint, and First Amended Complaint is incorporated into this Notice Letter, along with Plaintiff Hernandez’ original PAGA Notice Letter to the LWDA, submitted on July 24, 2025 (LWDA Case No. CM-1114191-25) which will add Plaintiff Williams’ claims under the Act against all Defendants, including under the PAGA to the ongoing action in Los Angeles County.

We also set forth herein the facts and theories and the California Labor Code violations which Defendants engaged in with respect to Plaintiffs and all their Aggrieved Employees in California. The attached Class Action Complaint provides the details of Plaintiffs’ class-wide claims and claims under the Act, and the applicable California law governing them. It, along with this Notice Letter, addresses in detail numerous violations that subject Defendants to civil and statutory penalties under the Act.

Relevant Facts

Plaintiffs were employed by Defendants as non-exempt, hourly employees based out of Defendants’ locations in California. Aggrieved Employees include all non-exempt hourly employees of Defendants within the state of California from one year prior to the date of this letter and continuing through the present. Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees are collectively referred to herein as “Aggrieved Employees.” Aggrieved Employees consistently worked at Defendants’ behest and under their control and subject to their policies and practices without being paid all wages due. Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees all wages due and owing because Defendants failed to pay for stand-by pay. Defendants also failed to properly account for bonus pay in the employees’ regular rate or standby pay. Defendants would contact Plaintiff Hernandez when he was needed at work. Defendants required Plaintiff Williams to be available to work within 2 hours notice.

Defendants required Plaintiff Williams to be within 30 miles away from the jobsite on those days. During this time, Plaintiffs were under Defendant’s control because they would then have to report to work. Upon information and belief, Aggrieved Employees were also required to be on-call and were not compensated for on-call or standby pay. Moreover, Defendants required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to be on-call at all times and the Defendants did not pay the proper amount for the waiting time, if they were paid at all. When Plaintiff Hernandez and the class members were called to work, they had 10 minutes to report to work; therefore, Plaintiffs and the class members were required, when they were off the clock, to remain within 10 minutes from



Defendants' worksites. Plaintiff Williams was required to be on call for one weekend per month from 6:00 p.m. Friday until the following Sunday at 7:00 A.M.. Plaintiff Williams remained under the control of the Defendants during this time and was not paid.

The Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were paid quarterly bonuses based on performance which generally averaged \$300 per quarter. Upon information and belief, these bonuses were not properly reflected in the wage statements and were not included in the calculation of the employees' regular rate.

Plaintiffs are also informed and believe that there are other Aggrieved Employees employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees within the state of California within the statutory time period who suffer or suffered from the same wage and hour violations outlined below.

Defendants had a common policy and/or practice of failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages for all hours worked. Aggrieved Employees were either not paid by Defendants for all hours worked or were not paid at the appropriate minimum, regular and overtime rates. Plaintiffs also contend that Defendants failed to pay Aggrieved Employees all wages due and owing, including by requiring off the clock work, failing to provide meal and rest breaks, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, failing to timely pay wages including final wages, failing to maintain accurate records, and failing to reimburse for necessary business expenses all in violation of various provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

During the course of Aggrieved Employees' employment with Defendants, they were not paid all wages they were owed, including for all work performed resulting in off the clock work. Defendants required Aggrieved Employees to perform pre-shift and post-shift off the clock work. For instance, Defendants required use of their personal cell phone use of personal computers, office equipment, office supplies, personal vehicle usage, and personal medical equipment usage for work-related activities, such as texting and calling supervisors, and co-workers, and checking schedule off-the-clock. Additionally, Employees were required to perform their regular job duties before and after clocking in on occasion.

By implementing policies, programs, practices, procedures and protocols which resulted in off the clock work, Defendants' willful actions resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages and overtime pay to Aggrieved Employees. For example, the off the clock work addressed above caused Aggrieved Employees to begin receiving overtime pay later than they should have.

As a result of the above described requirements to work off the clock, and the other wage violations they endured at Defendants' hands, Aggrieved Employees were not properly paid all wages earned and all wages owed to them by Defendants, including when working more than eight (8) hours in any given day and/or more than forty (40) hours in any given week. Moreover, the uncompensated time, discussed above, was worked by Aggrieved Employees in excess of 8 hours a day and/or 40 hours a week, further entitling Aggrieved Employees overtime wages which they were consistently denied, all in violation of Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.



Additionally, Defendants failed to provide all the legally required unpaid, off-duty meal periods and all the legally required paid, off-duty rest periods to Aggrieved Employees, as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. Aggrieved Employees were required to perform work as ordered by Defendants for more than five (5) hours during a shift but were often required to do so without receiving a lawful and timely meal break. In addition to untimely meal periods, Defendants also required Aggrieved Employees to respond to work demands. Defendants placed their needs over Aggrieved Employees' lawful meal and rest breaks and this resulted in Aggrieved Employees often having to work through their scheduled meal and/or rest breaks, or otherwise taking shortened ones, because the demands of the job would not avail them the opportunity to take a lawfully uninterrupted and off duty meal and/or rest break.

On the occasions when Aggrieved Employees worked over 10 hours in a shift, Defendants also failed to provide them with a second, uninterrupted, timely and duty-free meal period. As a result, Defendants' failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with all legally required off-duty, unpaid meal periods and all the legally required off-duty, paid rest periods is and will be evidenced by Defendants' business records, or lack thereof. Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee's effective hourly rate of pay, including their earned commission, for each meal period or rest break that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided.

Therefore, Defendants have regularly required Aggrieved Employees to work shifts in excess of five (5) hours without providing them with uninterrupted meal periods of not less than thirty (30) minutes, and shifts in excess of (10) hours without providing them with second meal periods of not less than thirty minutes; nor did Defendants pay Aggrieved Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee's effective hourly rate of pay for each meal period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided. Further, what meal periods Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees were taken were on-duty due to Defendants' policy and practice requiring Aggrieved Employees to remain on-call and keep work phones on during meal periods, all in violation of Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

Additionally, Defendants failed to provide all the legally required paid, off-duty rest periods to Aggrieved Employees, as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. were also not authorized and permitted to take lawful rest periods, were systematically required by Defendants to work through or during breaks and were not provided with one (1) hour's wages in lieu thereof. Aggrieved Employees were restricted in their ability to take their full ten (10) minutes net rest time or were otherwise not provided with duty-free rest periods. Therefore, Defendants have consistently failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paid rest breaks of not less than ten minutes for every work period of four or more consecutive hours; or major fraction thereof, nor did Defendant pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay for each day on which requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided.

Defendants paid Plaintiffs and Employees nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses. However, upon information and belief, Defendants failed to incorporate all remunerations, including nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or



nondiscretionary bonuses, into the calculation of the regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating sick pay. Therefore, during times when Plaintiffs and Employees worked overtime and received nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, Defendants failed to pay all sick pay by paying a lower overtime rate than required.

Additionally, Defendants paid Plaintiffs and Employees nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses. However, upon information and belief, Defendants failed to incorporate all remunerations, including nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, into the calculation of the regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating vacation pay. Therefore, during times when Plaintiffs and Employees worked overtime and received nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, Defendants failed to pay all vacation pay by paying a lower overtime rate than required.

Defendants also consistently failed to issue accurate itemized wage statements as required by Labor Code § 226(a). Specifically, the wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees failed to accurately account for unpaid wages and overtime because their actual hours worked were under-reported due to off the clock work. Additionally, the wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees failed to accurately account for premium pay for deficiently provided meal and rest breaks. Moreover, Defendants failed to state their Employee Identification, employee address, and regular and vacation pay rates on Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees' wage statements.

Specifically, Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep accurate records of the correct overtime wages based on proper regular rate calculations that included nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses earned, and the total amount of compensation of their Employees. Moreover, the wage statements given to Employees by Defendants failed to accurately account for wages, overtime, and premium pay for deficient meal periods and rest breaks all of which Defendants knew or reasonably should have known were owed to Employees, as alleged hereinabove. The wage statements provided to Employees were confusing and required employees to engage in discovery and refer to outside sources to verify whether their pay was correct and potentially resulting in a miscalculation by the Employees.

Additionally, Defendants failed to pay Aggrieved Employees all wages owed, as detailed above, at the time of their termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of their resignation, as required under Labor Code § 203. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were not paid all regular and overtime wages at the time of termination, because Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked, required off the clock work. Additionally, Defendants failed to pay premium wages owed for unprovided meal and rest periods, as further detailed in this Complaint. Defendants' failure to pay said wages within the required time was willful within the meaning of Labor Code § 203.

Defendants also failed to reimburse Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenses. Defendants have regularly required Plaintiffs to incur business expenses in the course of performing their required job duties for Defendants including for cell phone usage and office supplies. Upon information and belief, Aggrieved Employees incurred similar costs. These expenses incurred by Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees were necessary and required of them in



performing their assigned job duties, but Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees for all such necessary expenditures, thus entitling them to reimbursement according to proof as required under Labor Code § 2802 and the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage Orders.

PAGA Claim Details, Legal Bases for Violations and Penalties:

As addressed above and in further detail in the attached Class Action Complaint, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees complain of the following violations committed by Defendants:

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages for all hours worked. California Labor Code § 1197, entitled “Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage” states, “[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” The applicable minimum wages fixed by the commission for work during the relevant period is found in the Wage Orders.

In California, employees must be paid at least the then applicable state minimum wage for all hours worked, including under Labor Code § 1197, IWC Wage Order MW-2014, and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), and 4(A)-4(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Paragraph 2(H) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders defines “Hours Worked” as “the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.” Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked. Defendants failed to do so.

California Labor Code § 1197, entitled “Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage” states: “The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” The minimum wage provisions of California Labor Code are enforceable by private civil action pursuant to Labor Code § 1194(a) which states: “Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit.”

As described in California Labor Code §§ 1185 and 1194.2, any action for wages incorporates the applicable Wage Order of the California Industrial Welfare Commission. Also, California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and those Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders entitle non-exempt employees to an amount equal to or greater than the minimum wage for all hours worked. All hours must be paid at the statutory or agreed rate, or at the minimum rate in the absence of a contractually agreed upon one. The underpayment of wages to Aggrieved Employees is and has been a direct consequence of Defendants’ unlawful compensation policies and practices, which applied uniformly to the Aggrieved Employees working at locations and work sites throughout California.



During the course of Aggrieved Employees' employment with Defendants, they were not paid all wages they were owed, including for all work performed resulting in off the clock work. Defendants required use of personal cell phone for work-related activities, such as texting and calling supervisors, and co-workers, and checking schedule off-the-clock. Plaintiff Williams, a Registered Nurse Case manager was required to work off-site and provide patient care in addition to working in Defendants' facilities. For at least 3-4 times per week Plaintiff Williams, before clocking in for work, was required to check patient charts, plan her route for the next day, call/text patients to confirm their appointment time.

Plaintiff Williams further worked, without pay, to prepare her supplies and personal vehicle to visit patients, complete patient charting, charge her laptop computer, and plug in her car to facilitate patient visits. Additionally, Employees were required to perform their regular job duties before and after clocking in on occasion. Aggrieved Employees were also required to work during meal breaks due to Defendants policy requiring Aggrieved Employees to remain on-call during and keep their work phones on during meal breaks.

In light of the forgoing, the Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties. Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the unpaid minimum wages (including double minimum wages), liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum wages unlawfully unpaid, interest thereon and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a). Plaintiffs and the other Aggrieved Employees further request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory and civil penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes, including pursuant to Labor Code § 558, and Wage Order provisions. To the extent minimum wage compensation is determined to be owed to the Aggrieved Employees who have terminated their employment, Defendants' conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under California Labor Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these Aggrieved Employees. Defendants' failure to timely pay all wages owed also violated Labor Code § 204 and resulted in violations of Labor Code § 226 because they resulted in the issuance of inaccurate wage statements. Defendants' conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs are seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime in Violation of Labor Code § 510

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees earned wages and overtime and double time. Specifically, Defendants had a consistent policy of not paying Employees wages for all hours worked, including hours at their required regular, overtime, and double-time rates, or of miscalculating them by not including all forms of remuneration in the regular rate of compensation. Defendants, and each of them, have intentionally and improperly changed, adjusted



and/or modified certain employees' hours, including Plaintiff's, or required Aggrieved Employees to do so, or otherwise caused them to work off the clock to avoid paying Aggrieved Employees all earned and owed straight time and overtime wages and other benefits.

Defendants have violated Labor Code § 1194 and Labor Code § 510 (and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A) and 4(A)-4(B) of the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission) by failing to pay Employees: (a) time and one-half their regular hourly rates for hours worked in excess of eight hours in a workday or in excess of forty hours in any workweek or for the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek; or (b) twice their regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of twelve hours in any one day or for hours worked in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of work in a workweek. Defendants had a consistent policy of not paying Employees wages for all hours worked, including by requiring off the clock work as addressed above and by under-reporting actual hours worked. With work shifts generally requiring eight hours or more of work on a given day, this unpaid off the clock work resulted in Aggrieved Employees working past eight hours on a shift or more than forty hours in a week, which required that they be paid at the correct overtime rate of 1.5 times their regular rate.

When considered in combination with the other wage violations addressed above, Aggrieved Employees were not properly compensated, nor were they paid overtime and double time rates for hours worked in excess of eight hours or twelve hours in a given day, and/or forty hours in a given week. Defendants did not make available to Employees a reasonable protocol for correcting time records when Employees worked overtime hours or to fix incorrect time entries or those that Defendants unlawfully under-recorded to the Employee's detriment. Defendants have also violated these provisions by requiring Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods when they were required to be clocked out or to otherwise work off the clock to complete their daily job duties.

Furthermore, on information and belief, Defendants did not pay Plaintiffs and Employees the correct overtime rate for the recorded overtime hours that they generated. In addition to an hourly wage, Defendants paid Plaintiffs and Employees nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses. However, upon information and belief, Defendants failed to incorporate all remunerations, including nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, into the calculation of the regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating the overtime wage rate.

Therefore, during times when Plaintiffs and Employees worked overtime and received nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, Defendants failed to pay all overtime wages by paying a lower overtime rate than required.

In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to the California Labor Code, including Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1174, 1194, 1198, 1199, and the relevant paragraphs of the IWC Wage Orders, including paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A), 4, and 20. Defendants are liable to Employees for the full amount of all their unpaid wages and overtime compensation, with interest, plus their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, as well as the



assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, and each of them, and any additional sums as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs are seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Meal-Period Liability Under Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and Penalties

Defendants have regularly required Aggrieved Employees to work shifts in excess of five hours without providing them with uninterrupted meal periods of not less than thirty minutes as required under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and paragraph 11 of the applicable Wage Orders. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were forced to incur shortened meal periods, were provided with breaks late and well after the fifth hour of work, could not be relieved to take breaks, or were required to remain on-duty at all times and were unable to take off-duty breaks or were otherwise not provided with the opportunity to take required breaks.

On the occasions when Aggrieved Employees were provided with a meal period, it was often untimely or interrupted by having to respond to work demands or remain under Defendant's control, in violation of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders. On shifts over ten hours, second meal periods were not provided. Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee's effective regular rate of pay, for each meal period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided, including by miscalculating any premium payments they did make. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 11 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each meal period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions. Defendants also miscalculated the rate at which they paid any meal period or rest period premiums when Defendant did attempt to pay them, resulting in further violations of section 226.7.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs are seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2) and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7 and Penalties

Defendants have consistently failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paid rest breaks of not less than ten minutes for every work period of four or more consecutive hours, as required under Labor Code § 226.7. Specifically, Defendants provided rest periods untimely or for shortened durations, and Defendants' policies and procedures required Aggrieved Employees to remain under Defendants' control during breaks to respond to job requirements.

Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay for each day on which requisite



rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided, or miscalculated any premiums paid. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 12 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each rest period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs are seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Vacation Wages

Pursuant to California Labor Code § 227.3, whenever a contract of employment or employment policy provides for paid vacation and an employee is terminated without having taken off his vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to him as wages at his final rate in accordance with said contract of employment or policy respecting eligibility or time served. Defendants paid nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses to Aggrieved Employees but Defendants failed to include these forms of remuneration in the regular rate of pay from which vacation wages were calculated and paid. Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 227.3. Plaintiffs accordingly seek this relief available for Defendants' violations of section Labor Code § 227.3 in connection with Aggrieved Employees and seeking the civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 227.3, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699.3(b), and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Comply with Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246

California Labor Code § 245 *et seq.* requires that Defendants provide paid sick time to Aggrieved Employees, including at the amount, terms, and rate of compensation set forth in said law. At times relevant, Defendants have failed compute the amount due for paid sick time in conformance with the pay calculation under California Labor Code § 246(1). Defendants paid nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses to Aggrieved Employees but Defendants failed to include these forms of remuneration in the regular rate of pay from which sick pay was calculated and paid. Rather than calculating the amount of paid sick time due when sick time is used according to the requirements set forth in California Labor Code § 246(1), Defendants paid sick leave to Aggrieved Employees at a lower rate, in violation of the law. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Defendants have violated California Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246. Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 245 *et seq.* and 246. Plaintiffs accordingly seek this relief available for Defendants' violations of section Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246 in connection with Aggrieved Employees and seeking the civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699.3(b), and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).



Failure to Issue Accurate and Itemized Wage Statements in Violation of Labor Code § 226

California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to furnish each employee with an accurate, itemized wage statements in writing. These statements must be appended to the detachable part of the check, draft, voucher, or whatever else serves to pay the employee's wages; or, if wages are paid by cash or personal check, these statements may be given to the employee separately from the payment of wages; in either case the employer must give the employee these statements twice a month or each time wages are paid. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 226(a), Aggrieved Employees suffered injuries, including among other things confusion over whether they received all wages owed them, the difficulty and expense involved in reconstructing pay records, and forcing them to make mathematical computations to analyze whether the wages paid in fact compensated them correctly for all hours worked.

Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code and paragraph 7 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Any wage statements given to Employees by Defendants necessarily failed to accurately account for wages, overtime, and premium pay, including by failing to pay for all hours worked, failure to pay for all overtime hours worked or at the correct rate of pay and for providing deficient meal and rest breaks, all of which Defendants knew or reasonably should have known were owed to the Employees, as alleged above. Moreover, Defendants failed to state their Employee Identification, employee address, and regular and vacation pay rates on Plaintiffs' last wage statements.

Specifically, the wage statements given to Employees, by Defendants, failed to include the above requirements enumerated above. Employees' wage statements did not include: the total hours worked in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2) and failed to accurately set forth all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each such rate in violation of Labor Code § 226 (a)(9). The wage statements provided to Employees were confusing and required Employees to engage in discovery and refer to outside sources to verify whether their pay was correct and potentially resulting in a miscalculation by the Employees. Additionally, Specifically, Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep accurate records of the correct overtime wages based on proper regular rate calculations that included nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses earned, and the total amount of compensation of their Employees. Moreover, the wage statements given to Employees by Defendants failed to accurately account for wages, overtime, and premium pay for deficient meal periods and rest breaks, all of which Defendants knew or reasonably should have known were owed to Employees, as alleged hereinabove. The wage statements provided to Employees were confusing and required Employees to engage in discovery and refer to outside sources to verify whether their pay was correct and potentially resulting in a miscalculation by the Employees.

Employees' wage statements did not include: the total hours worked in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2) and failed to accurately set forth all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each such rate in violation of Labor Code § 226



(a)(9).

In light of these violations, and pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226(e) and paragraphs 4(b), 7, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000). They are also entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs assert PAGA claims for failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ..."

Failure to Issue Semimonthly Payments in Violation of Labor Code § 204

In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees wages, overtime, premium pay, etc., and failing to provide them with checks and wage statements, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as well as the meal and rest periods taken by Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and the applicable IWC wage orders.

Defendants also required Aggrieved Employees to work hours off the clock for which they were not compensated, including during interrupted or otherwise on-duty meal and rest periods. Defendants also failed to pay all overtime premium wages owed for work conducted on a work shift and a workday, or miscalculated these premiums by not including all forms of remuneration in the regular rate, as addressed above. Therefore, when Aggrieved Employees received wage statements and pay checks, they did not compensate all hours worked on a timely basis, resulting in Defendants' systematic failure to pay all wages owed to Aggrieved Employees twice monthly in accordance with the requirements of Labor Code § 204. Additionally, by not providing wage statements as required under section 204, Defendants systematically violated Labor Code § 204 and § 226.

Given the above described off the clock work and deductions from hours worked perpetrated by Defendants' management, Plaintiffs were not paid at the correct overtime rate for all hours she worked after eight hours into a shift or over forty in a work week and that she was not paid all



double time owed either. Defendants' uniformly applied payroll policies and practices thus resulted in further systematic and ongoing violations of the requirements of Labor Code § 204.

In light of the foregoing, Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties, interest, fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201.3, 210, 218.5, 558, and 1194. In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages and overtime, and off the clock work, by not providing proper meal and rest periods, failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and failing to pay Employees wages upon termination or timely upon resignation, all discussed above, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants also failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and paragraph 7 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, entitling Aggrieved Employees to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs assert PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 203, 204, 2926, 2927, and 2699.5 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Keep Records In Accordance With Labor Code § 1174

Labor Code § 1174 requires employers to keep records showing payroll data and the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to employees. By failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages, overtime, double time, premium pay, and by not recording meal period start and end times, all discussed herein, Defendants failed to maintain proper employment records in accordance with Section 1174. In light of the foregoing, Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1174.5 and 2699, *et seq.* Defendants have also failed to comply with paragraph 7 of the applicable California IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period, meal period, wages earned pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, and total daily hours worked by itemizing in wage statements all deductions from payment of wages and accurately reporting total hours worked by the Aggrieved Employees, and they are entitled to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs assert PAGA claims for failure to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, 1198, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Waiting Time Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 203



Some Aggrieved Employees no longer work for Defendants; they either resigned or were terminated from Defendants' employ. Based on the forgoing, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay all wages and tips earned by and owed to Aggrieved Employees at the time of their termination of within seventy-two hours of their resignation, as required by California under Labor Code § 203. In light of the forgoing, Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558 and further specifically seek penalties and wages under Labor Code § 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue until paid for up to thirty (30) days from the date they were due.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs assert PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Business Expenditures in Violation of Labor Code § 2802

Defendants required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to pay for necessary work related expenses they incurred. Defendants required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to use their personal cellular phones and office supplies. However, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff, and upon information and belief the other Aggrieved Employees.

Defendants systematically and uniformly failed to reimburse those lawful and necessary work related expenses or losses incurred in direct discharge of their job duties during employment with Defendants and at the direction of the Defendants pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, paragraph 9. Defendants are liable for PAGA penalties resulting from their failure to reimburse necessary business expenses incurred by the Aggrieved Employees. Accordingly, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover, and hereby seek through this Representative Action, all civil and statutory penalties authorized for violations of California Labor Code §§ 1198 and 2802, and Section 9(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and Plaintiffs seek all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2699(f)(2), and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Unfair Competition Under Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.

Consequently, Defendants' conduct has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees and the general public in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

Plaintiffs' PAGA Claim under Labor Code § 2698 et seq. and Recovery Bases:

After complying with the notice procedures of Labor Code § 2699.3 and the running of the notice period after the filing of the attached Class Action Complaint, Plaintiffs will file an amended Complaint asserting, as a representative action on behalf of the California Attorney General and the other similarly Aggrieved Employees, a PAGA claim for violations of the above addressed



underlying claims and seeking penalties as specified by the applicable corresponding provisions.

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees seek penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699 for Defendants' violation of Labor Code provisions included under Labor Code § 2699.5, including the penalty provisions, without limitation, based, *inter alia*, on the following California Labor Code sections: §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 248, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.* and 2802, including as follows:

(a) Wage Claims: For failure to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees all earned regular pay and minimum wages for regular hours worked and for failure to pay overtime premium wages for overtime hours worked under Labor Code §§ 510, 1194(a), 1197, and 1198, and paragraphs 2(K), 3(A), 4(A), 4(B) and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(b) Meal and Rest Period Claims: For failure to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees off-duty, timely, and unpaid meal periods and failure to authorize and permit them to take off-duty, timely, and paid rest periods, or pay one hour of regular pay in lieu thereof, under Labor Code §§ 512, 1198, and 226.7, and Sections 11, 12(A), and 12(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable, including under paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and wages under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(c) Inaccurate Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Records: For failure to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees with wage statements or with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ...";

(d) Failure to Timely Pay Wages: For failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable



IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(e) Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses: For Defendants' failure to reimburse the necessary work related expenses incurred under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802, and Sections 2(K), 4, 9, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), seeking civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, 2699.5, and 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 9 and 20 of the IWC Wage Orders, and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(f) Failure to Provide Paid Sick Days: For Defendants' failure to provide Employees with all their required and earned sick days in violation of Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246 the civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699.3(b), and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(g) Failure to Pay Vacation Wages: For Defendants' failure to provide Employees with all their vacation days in violation of Labor Code § 227.3 and seeking the civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 227.3, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699.3(b), and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1); and

(h) All Alleged Violations of the IWC Wage Orders: For any above addressed violation of the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage Orders constituting violations of Labor Code § 1198 and Labor Code § 2699.5, and seeking penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

We have been constrained to initially move forward with the filing of a Second Amended Complaint, alleging the PAGA claim bases and Plaintiffs discussed herein, without asserting an amended PAGA claim. . At no time did the Aggrieved Employees reside at the place of their employment.

As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid the full amount of split-shift premiums earned during each pay period during the applicable limitations period. Pursuant to Labor Code section 204, 218.6 and 226.7, Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and the Aggrieved Employees, seek to recover unpaid premium wages, interest thereon, and costs of suit.

This letter, along with the original PAGA notice letter and the attached Complaint and First Amended complaint pending in Los Angeles County, therefore provide the requisite notice under the Act to the LWDA and Defendants by setting forth the specific provisions of the Labor Code and related provisions Plaintiffs allege have been violated, including the facts and relevant theories alleged against Premier Infusion and Healthcare Services, Inc., Premier Infusion & Healthcare Services, and Premier Infusion Care and any other named Defendants and joint



employers. To prevent the violations described in the Complaint, the First Amended Complaint, and the original PAGA letter, and herein from occurring, and to remedy past violations, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the LWDA conduct an investigation into Defendants' employment practices in accordance with the Act.

Wherefore we request that you advise us, by certified mail within sixty days of the postmark on this letter, whether you intend to proceed with these claims or whether Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees should include them in an amended Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* claim under the Act in an amended Complaint.

Regards,

D.LAW, INC.

Roman Shkodnik
Jean Hopkins Power

Cc: Premier Infusion and Healthcare Services, Inc. Premier Infusion & Healthcare Services
and Premier Infusion Care by Certified Mail

D.LAW, INC.
 Emil Davtyan (SBN 299363)
 emil@d.law
 David Yeremian (SBN 226337)
 d.yeremian@d.law
 Roman Shkodnik (SBN 285152)
 r.shkodnik@d.law
 Jean Hopkins Power (SBN 326509)
 j.power@d.law
 450 N Brand Blvd. Suite 840
 Glendale, CA 91203
 Telephone: (818) 962-6465
 Facsimile: (818) 962-6469

Attorneys for Plaintiff JAIME HERNANDEZ
 and all others similarly situated,

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

JAIME HERNANDEZ, on behalf of himself
 and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PREMIER INFUSION AND HEALTHCARE
 SERVICES, INC., a California corporation;
 PREMIER INFUSION & HEALTHCARE
 SERVICES, an entity of unknown form;
 PREMIER INFUSION CARE, an entity of
 unknown form; and DOES 1 through 50,
 inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 25STCV21888

CLASS ACTION

Assigned for All Purposes To:
 Hon. Judge William F. Highberger
 Dept.: SS10

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
 COMPLAINT FOR:**

3. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
2. Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime Under Labor Code § 510;
4. Meal-Period Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7;
5. Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7;
6. Failure to Pay Vacation Wages
7. Failure to Comply with Labor Code § 245 *et seq.* and 246
8. Reimbursement of Necessary Expenditures Under Labor Code § 2802;
9. Violation of Labor Code § 226(a);
10. Failure to Keep Required Payroll Records Under Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5;
11. Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 203;
12. Violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*; and
13. Penalties under PAGA Labor Code § 2698.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Original Complaint Filed: July 24, 2025
 Trial Date: None Set

1 Plaintiff JAIME HERNANDEZ, (“Plaintiff”) on behalf of himself and all others similarly
2 situated (collectively, “Employees”; individually, “Employee”) complains of Defendants, and each
3 of them, as follows:

4 INTRODUCTION

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all current and former
6 Employees within the State of California who, at any time four (4) years prior to the filing of this
7 lawsuit, are or were employed as non-exempt, hourly employees by Defendants PREMIER
8 INFUSION AND HEALTHCARE SERVICES, INC. (“Premier Infusion and Healthcare”), a
9 California corporation; PREMIER INFUSION & HEALTHCARE SERVICES (“Premier Infusion
10 & Healthcare Services”), an entity of unknown form; PREMIER INFUSION CARE (“Premier
11 Infusion Care”), an entity of unknown form; and DOES 1 through 50 (all defendants being
12 collectively referred to herein as “Defendants”). Plaintiff alleges that Defendants, and each of
13 them, violated various provisions of the California Labor Code, relevant orders of the Industrial
14 Welfare Commission (IWC) and California Business & Professions Code, and seeks redress,
15 therefore.

16 2. Plaintiff was a resident of California and during the time period relevant to this
17 Complaint and was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt hourly employee within the State of
18 California at Defendants’ facilities in California. Plaintiff and the other Class members worked for
19 Defendants in California and Los Angeles County, and in other nonexempt positions, throughout
20 California, and consistently worked at Defendants’ behest without being paid all wages due. More
21 specifically, Plaintiff and the other similarly situated Class members were employed by
22 Defendants and worked at Defendants’ facilities where the conduct giving rise to the allegations in
23 this Class Action Complaint occurred. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff was employed by
24 Defendants and (1) shared similar job duties and responsibilities, (2) was subjected to the same
25 policies and practices, and (3) endured similar violations at the hands of Defendants as the other
26 Employee Class members who served in similar and related positions.

27 3. Defendants required Plaintiff and the Employees in the Class to perform work
28 while remaining under Defendants’ control before and after being on the clock for their daily work

1 shift. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Employees with lawful meal and rest periods, as
2 employees were not provided with the opportunity to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free
3 meal and rest periods as required by the Labor Code. Defendants also failed to pay all wages due
4 and owing for on-call time. Defendants thus failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class members for all
5 hours worked, and provided them with inaccurate wage statements that prevented Plaintiff and the
6 Class from learning of these unlawful pay practices.

7 **THE PARTIES**

8 **A. The Plaintiff**

9 4. Plaintiff, JAIME HERNANDEZ, has resided in California and during the time
10 period relevant to this Complaint and was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt hourly
11 employee within the State of California.

12 **B. The Defendants**

13 5. Defendant PREMIER INFUSION AND HEALTHCARE SERVICES, INC. is a
14 California corporation with its principle executive offices in Torrance, California, and has been
15 listed as the employer on the wage statements issued during the relevant time period. Premier
16 Desert Jack lists a California address in Torrance, California with the California Secretary of State,
17 and employs Plaintiff and the Class members in Los Angeles County, including at Defendants'
18 offices and facilities in Torrance, California, and throughout California and conducts business
19 throughout California.

20 6. Defendant PREMIER INFUSION & HEALTHCARE SERVICES is an entity of
21 unknown form and has been listed as the employer on the wage statements issued during the
22 relevant time period. PREMIER INFUSION & HEALTHCARE SERVICES employed Plaintiff
23 and the Class members in Los Angeles County, including at Defendants' offices and facilities in
24 Torrance, California, and throughout California and conducts business throughout California.

25 7. Defendant PREMIER INFUSION CARE is an entity of unknown form and has
26 been listed as the employer on the wage statements issued during the relevant time period.
27 PREMIER INFUSION CARE employed Plaintiff and the Class members in Los Angeles County,
28 including at Defendants' offices and facilities in Torrance, California, and throughout California

1 and conducts business throughout California.

2 8. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or
3 whatever else, of the Defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, are currently
4 unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious names under Code of
5 Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
6 designated herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, and each of them, are legally responsible in
7 some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend
8 this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the Defendants designated herein as
9 Does 1 through 50 when their identities become known.

10 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted in
11 all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants, that Defendants carried
12 out a joint scheme, business plan, or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and that the acts of
13 each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants. Furthermore, Defendants acted in
14 all respects as the employers or joint employers of Employees. Defendants, and each of them,
15 exercised control over the wages, hours or working conditions of Employees, or suffered or
16 permitted Employees to work, or engaged, thereby creating a common law employment
17 relationship, with Employees. Therefore, Defendants, and each of them, employed or jointly
18 employed Employees.

19 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

20 10. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil
21 Procedure § 410.10 and California Business & Professions Code § 17203. This Action is brought
22 as a Class Action on behalf of similarly situated Employees of Defendants pursuant to California
23 Code of Civil Procedure § 382. Venue as to Defendants is also proper in this judicial district
24 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 395 *et seq.* Upon information and belief, the
25 obligations and liabilities giving rise to this lawsuit occurred at least in part in Los Angeles
26 County and Defendants maintain and operate company offices and facilities in Los Angeles
27 County and employ Plaintiff and other Class members in California Los Angeles County and
28 throughout California.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

11. The Employees who comprise the Class and Collective, including Plaintiff, is a nonexempt employee pursuant to the applicable Wage Order of the IWC. Defendants hire Employees who work in nonexempt positions at the direction of Defendants in the State of California. Plaintiff and the Class members were either not paid by Defendants for all hours worked or were not paid at the appropriate minimum, regular and overtime rates. Specifically, Defendants required use of personal cell phone for work-related activities, such as texting and calling supervisors, and co-workers, and checking schedule off-the-clock. Additionally, Employees were required to perform their regular job duties before and after clocking in on occasion. Plaintiff also contends that Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class members all wages due and owing, including by failing to provide sufficient compensation for on-call time, failed to provide meal and rest breaks, failed to properly account for bonus

12. pay in the employees' regular rate, and failed to furnish accurate wage statements, all in violation of various provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

13. During the course of Plaintiff and the Class members' employment with Defendants, they were not paid all wages they were owed, including for all work performed and for all overtime hours worked and were forced to work during their meal and rest breaks to keep labor budgets low.

14. Defendants also failed to pay Class Members all wages due and owing because Defendants failed to pay for on-call or standby time. Specifically, Defendants would contact Plaintiff and inform him that he was needed at work. Plaintiff then had to report to work and was not paid on-call or standby pay. Upon information and belief, Class Members were also required to be on-call and were not compensated for on-call or standby pay.

15. Moreover, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Class members to be on-call at all times and the Defendants did not pay for the waiting time. When Plaintiff and the class members were called to work, they had 10 minutes to report to work; therefore, Plaintiff and the class members were required, when they were off the clock, to remain within 10 minutes from Defendants' worksites.

1 16. The Plaintiff and Class Members were paid quarterly bonuses based on
2 performance which generally averaged \$300 per quarter. Upon information and belief, these
3 bonuses were not properly reflected in the wage statements and were not included in the
4 calculation of the employees' regular rate.

5 17. As a matter of Company culture, Plaintiff and the Class members were required to
6 work during their meal breaks which were not compensated by Defendants in violation of the
7 California Labor Code. Plaintiff and the Class members were also not paid regular wages and
8 overtime for the time they were required to comply with other requirements imposed upon them,
9 which they had to complete while working through their meal breaks and without compensation.
10 As a result Plaintiff and the Class members worked shifts over eight (8) hours in a day and over
11 forty (40) hours in a work week, but they were not paid at the appropriate overtime rate for all
12 such hours, including by being required to perform work duties and tasks without pay and while
13 off-the-clock which caused overtime to begin accruing before it did in Defendants' timekeeping
14 and payroll systems. As a result, Plaintiff and the Class members worked substantial overtime
15 hours during their employment with Defendants for which they were not compensated, in
16 violation of the California Labor Code, applicable IWC Wage Orders.

17 18. As a result of the above described daily work demands and pressures to work
18 through breaks, and the other wage violations they endured at Defendants' hands, Plaintiff and the
19 Class members were not properly paid for all wages earned and for all wages owed to them by
20 Defendants, including when working more than eight (8) hours in any given day and/or more than
21 forty (40) hours in any given week. As a result of Defendants' unlawful policies and practices,
22 Plaintiff and Class members incurred overtime hours worked for which they were not adequately
23 and completely compensated. To the extent applicable, Defendants also failed to pay Plaintiff and
24 the Class members at an overtime rate of 1.5 times the regular rate for the first eight hours of the
25 seventh consecutive work day in a week and overtime payments at the rate of 2 times the regular
26 rate for hours worked over eight (8) on the seventh consecutive work day, as required under the
27 Labor Code, applicable IWC Wage Orders.

28 19. From at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing to the

1 present, Defendants had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay Employees for all hours
2 worked, and failing to pay minimum wage for all time worked as required by California Law.

3 20. Additionally from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and
4 continuing to the present, Defendants had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay
5 Employees overtime compensation at premium overtime rates for all hours worked in excess of
6 eight (8) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, and double-time rates for all hours worked in
7 excess of twelve (12) hours a day, in violation of Labor Code § 510 and the corresponding
8 sections of IWC Wage Orders.

9 21. Therefore, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and
10 continuing to the present, Defendants paid Plaintiffs and Employees nondiscretionary
11 commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses. However, upon information and
12 belief, Defendants failed to incorporate all remunerations, including nondiscretionary
13 commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, into the calculation of the regular
14 rate of pay for purposes of calculating sick pay. Therefore, during times when Plaintiffs and
15 Employees worked overtime and received nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or
16 nondiscretionary bonuses, Defendants failed to pay all sick pay by paying a lower overtime rate
17 than required.

18 22. Additionally, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and
19 continuing to the present, Defendants paid Plaintiffs and Employees nondiscretionary
20 commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses. However, upon information and
21 belief, Defendants failed to incorporate all remunerations, including nondiscretionary
22 commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, into the calculation of the regular
23 rate of pay for purposes of calculating vacation pay. Therefore, during times when Plaintiffs and
24 Employees worked overtime and received nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or
25 nondiscretionary bonuses, Defendants failed to pay all vacation pay by paying a lower overtime
26 rate than required.

27 23. Additionally from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and
28 continuing to the present, Defendants have regularly required Employees to work shifts in excess

1 of five (5) hours without providing them with uninterrupted meal periods of not less than thirty
2 (30) minutes and shifts in excess of ten (10) hours without providing them with second meal
3 periods of not less than thirty minutes; nor did Defendants pay Employees “premium pay,” i.e. one
4 hour of wages at each Employee’s effective regular rate of pay, for each meal period that
5 Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided.

6 24. From at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing to the
7 present, Defendants have consistently failed to provide Employees with paid rest breaks of not less
8 than ten (10) minutes for every work period of four (4) or more consecutive hours; nor did
9 Defendant pay Employees premium pay for each day on which requisite rest breaks were not
10 provided or were deficiently provided at one hour of wages at each Employee’s effective regular
11 rate of pay, for each rest period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided.

12 25. Additionally, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, and
13 continuing to the present, Defendants have consistently failed to provide Employees with timely,
14 accurate, and itemized wage statements as required by California wage-and-hour laws.
15 Specifically, Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep accurate records of the
16 correct overtime wages based on proper regular rate calculations that included nondiscretionary
17 commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses earned, and the total amount of
18 compensation of their Employees. Moreover, the wage statements given to Employees by
19 Defendants failed to accurately account for wages, overtime, and premium pay for deficient meal
20 periods and rest breaks all of which Defendants knew or reasonably should have known were
21 owed to Employees, as alleged hereinabove. The wage statements provided to Employees were
22 confusing and required Employees to engage in discovery and refer to outside sources to verify
23 whether their pay was correct and potentially resulting in a miscalculation by the Employees.

24 26. Additionally, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, and
25 continuing to the present, Defendants have consistently failed to provide Employees with timely,
26 accurate, and itemized wage statements, in writing, as required by California wage-and-hour laws.
27 Specifically, Defendants failed to state their Employee Identification, employee address, and
28 regular and vacation pay rates on Plaintiff’s wage statements.

1 27. From at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing to the
2 present, Defendants have failed to reimburse Employees for expenses necessarily incurred in the
3 performance of their job duties for Defendants including, but not limited to, personal cell phone
4 usage and office supplies which were necessary to perform their duties under Defendants' employ
5 in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

6 28. Additionally, from at least three (3) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, and
7 continuing to the present, Defendants have consistently failed to keep accurate time and wage
8 records as required by California wage-and-hour laws.

9 29. Additionally, from at least four (4) years prior to filing this lawsuit and continuing
10 to the present, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay all wages fur and owed to
11 Employees at the time of their termination of within seventy-two (72) hours of their resignation, as
12 required by California wage-and-hour laws.

13 30. In light of the foregoing, Employees bring this action pursuant to, inter alia, Labor
14 Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 218.6, 226, 226.4, 226.7, 245, 246, 510, 512, 558, 558.1,
15 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2 1197, 1199, 2802, 2698 *et. seq.*, and California Code
16 of Regulations, Title 8, section 11000 *et seq.*

17 31. Furthermore, pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17200-17208,
18 Employees seek injunctive relief, restitution, and disgorgement of all benefits Defendants have
19 enjoyed from their violations of Labor Code.

20 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

21 32. Plaintiff bring this class action on behalf of himself, and all others similarly
22 situated pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382. Plaintiff seeks to represent a class defined as
23 follows: all individuals employed by Defendants, at any time within four (4) years of the filing of
24 this lawsuit and have been employed by Defendants within the State of California.

25 33. Further, Plaintiff seeks to represent the following Subclasses composed of and
26 defined as follows:

27 a. Subclass 1. Minimum Wages Subclass. All Class members who were not
28 compensated for all hours worked for Defendants at the applicable minimum wage.

1 b. Subclass 2. Wages and Overtime Subclass. All Class members who were not
2 compensated for all hours worked for Defendants at the required rates of pay, including for all
3 hours worked in excess of eight in a day and/or forty in a week.

4 c. Subclass 3. Vacation Wages Subclass. All Class members who were not
5 compensated at the Employee's regular rate of pay for their vacation wages.

6 d. Subclass 4. Sick Pay Subclass. All Class members who were not compensated at
7 the Employee's regular rate of pay for their sick pay wages.

8 e. Subclass 5. Meal Period Subclass. All Class members who were subject to
9 Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to provide unpaid 30-minute uninterrupted and duty-
10 free meal periods or one hour of pay at the Employee's regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

11 f. Subclass 6. Rest Break Subclass. All Class members who were subject to
12 Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to authorize and permit Employees to take
13 uninterrupted, duty-free, 10-minute rest periods for every four hours worked, or major fraction
14 thereof, and failing to pay one hour of pay at the Employee's regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

15 g. Subclass 7. Payroll Records Subclass. All Class members who were subject to
16 Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to keep accurate time and wage records as required
17 by California wage-and-hour laws.

18 h. Subclass 8. Wage Statement Subclass. All Class members who, within the
19 applicable limitations period, were not provided with accurate itemized wage statements.

20 i. Subclass 9. Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Business Expenditures. All Class
21 members who were subject to Defendants failing to reimburse for expenses necessarily incurred in
22 the performance of Employees job duties for Defendants which were necessary to perform their
23 duties under Defendants' employ.

24 j. Subclass 10. Termination Pay Subclass. All Class members who, within the
25 applicable limitations period, either voluntarily or involuntarily separated from their employment
26 and were subject to Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to timely pay wages upon
27 termination.

28 k. Subclass 11. UCL Subclass. All Class members who are owed restitution as a

1 result of Defendants' business acts and practices, to the extent such acts and practices are found to
2 be unlawful, deceptive, and/or unfair.

3 34. Plaintiff reserves the right under California Rule of Court 3.765 to amend or
4 modify the class description with greater particularity or further division into subclasses or
5 limitation to particular issues.

6 35. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action
7 under the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because there is a well-defined community
8 of interest in litigation and proposed class is easily ascertainable.

9 **A. Numerosity**

10 36. The potential members of the class as defined are so numerous that joinder of all
11 the member of the class is impracticable. While the precise number of class member has not been
12 determined at this time, Plaintiff is informed and believe that Defendants employ or, during the
13 time period relevant to this lawsuit, employed more than 100 individuals were employed by
14 Defendant's within the State of California.

15 37. Accounting for employee turnover during the relevant time period increases this
16 number substantially. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' employment records will provide
17 information as to the number and location of all class members.

18 **B. Commonality**

19 38. There are questions of law and fact common to the class that predominate over any
20 questions affecting only individual class members. These common questions of law and fact
21 include:

- 22 a. Whether Defendants failed to pay Employees minimum wages;
- 23 b. Whether Defendants failed to pay Employees wages for all hours worked;
- 24 c. Whether Defendants failed to pay Employees overtime as required under Labor
25 Code § 510;
- 26 d. Whether Defendants failed to pay Employees vacation wages as required under
27 Labor Code § 227.3;
- 28 e. Whether Defendants failed to pay Employees sick pay as required under Labor

Code § 245;

- f. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, by failing to provide Employees with requisite meal periods or premium pay in lieu thereof;
- g. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, by failing to provide Employees with requisite rest breaks or premium pay in lieu thereof;
- h. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code § 226(a);
- i. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5;
- j. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Employees for necessary business expenses;
- k. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by failing to pay wages and compensation due and owing at the time of termination of employment;
- l. Whether Defendants violated Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*;
- m. Whether Defendants are liable for penalties under Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*; and
- and
- n. Whether Employees are entitled to equitable relief pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

C. Typicality

39. The claims of the named plaintiffs are typical of those of the other Employees. Employees all sustained injuries and damages arising out of and caused by Defendant's common course of conducts in violation of statutes, as well as regulations that have the force and effect of law, as alleged herein.

D. Adequacy of Representation

40. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interest of Employees. Counsel who represents Employees are experienced and competent in litigating employment class actions.

//

1 **E. Superiority of Class Action**

2 41. A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient
3 adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all Employees is not practicable, and
4 questions of law and fact common to all Employees predominate over any questions affecting only
5 individual Employees. Each Employee has been damaged and is entitled to recovery by reason of
6 Defendants' illegal policies or practices of failing to compensate Employees properly.

7 42. Class action treatment will allow those persons similarly situated to litigate their
8 claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system.
9 Plaintiff is unaware of any difficulties in managing this case that should preclude class action.

10 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

12 **(Against All Defendants)**

13 43. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporate all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
14 full herein.

15 44. Defendants failed to pay Employees minimum wages for all hours worked.

16 45. Defendants had a common policy and practice of misstating Employees time
17 records and failing to pay Employees for all hours worked. Employees would work hours and not
18 receive wages, including as alleged above in connection with working during meal periods, and
19 time off the clock Employees without compensation. Specifically, Defendants required use of
20 personal cell phone for work-related activities, such as texting and calling supervisors, and co-
21 workers, and checking schedule off-the-clock. Additionally, Employees were required to perform
22 their regular job duties before and after clocking in on occasion. Furthermore, the uncompensated
23 time included the time Employees worked off-the-clock during meal periods as a result of
24 Defendants' high demand from clients. Further, Defendants had a policy requiring Employees to
25 remain on-call. Additionally, Defendants had a consistent policy of failing to pay Employees for
26 hours worked during alleged meal and rest periods for which Employees were consistently denied,
27 as also addressed herein. During the relevant time period, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and
28 Employees at the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked. Defendants' uniform pattern of

1 unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without limitation, applicable to the Class as a
2 whole, as a result of implementing a uniform policy and practice that denied accurate
3 compensation to Plaintiff and the other members of the Class as to minimum wage pay.

4 46. California Labor Code § 1197, entitled “Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage” states:

5 The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the
6 minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less
7 wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

8 47. The applicable minimum wages fixed by the commission for work during the
9 relevant period is found in the Wage Orders. Pursuant to the Wage Orders, Employees are
10 therefore entitled to double the minimum wage during the relevant period.

11 48. The minimum wage provisions of California Labor Code are enforceable by private
12 civil action pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a) which states:

13 Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any
14 employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal
15 overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to
16 recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of
17 this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest
18 thereon, reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit.

19 49. As described in California Labor Code §§ 1185 and 1194.2, any action for wages
20 incorporates the applicable Wage Order of the California Industrial Welfare Commission.

21 50. California Labor Code § 1194.2 also provides for the following remedies:

22 In any action under Section 1194 . . . to recover wages because of
23 the payment of a wage less than the minimum wages fixed by an
24 order of the commission, an employee shall be entitled to recover
25 liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully
26 unpaid and interest thereon.

27 51. Defendants have the ability to pay minimum wages for all time worked and have
28 willfully refused to pay such wages with the intent to secure for Defendants a discount upon this

1 indebtedness with the intent to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay, or defraud Employees.

2 52. Wherefore, Employees are entitled to recover the unpaid minimum wages
3 (including double minimum wages), liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum
4 wages unlawfully unpaid, interest thereon and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant
5 to California Labor Code § 1194(a).

6 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **FAILURE TO PAY WAGES AND OVERTIME UNDER LABOR CODE § 510**

8 **(Against All Defendants)**

9 53. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporate all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
10 full herein.

11 54. By their conduct, as set forth herein, Defendants violated California Labor Code §
12 510 (and the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission) by failing to pay Employees:
13 (a) time and one-half their regular hourly rates for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a
14 workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in any workweek or for the first eight (8) hours worked
15 on the seventh day of work in any one workweek; or (b) twice their regular rate of pay for hours
16 worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in any one (1) day or for hours worked in excess of eight
17 (8) hours on any seventh day of work in a workweek.

18 55. Defendants had a common policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and Employees
19 to perform work, off the clock for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Defendants
20 required use of personal cell phone for work-related activities, such as texting and calling
21 supervisors, and co-workers, and checking schedule off-the-clock. Additionally, Employees were
22 required to perform their regular job duties before and after clocking in on occasion. Additionally,
23 Employees would have to respond or received work-related calls while off the clock. Furthermore,
24 the uncompensated time included the time Employees worked off-the-clock during meal periods
25 as a result of Defendants' high demand from clients. All the forgoing work was performed by
26 Employees and under the direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages were paid.

27 56. The forgoing uncompensated work caused Plaintiff and Employees to work in
28 excess of eight (8), ten (10), and twelve (12) hours a day, and/or forty (40) hours a week, entitling

1 them to overtime and double-time wages which were systemically denied.

2 57. Furthermore, on information and belief, Defendants did not pay Plaintiffs and
3 Employees the correct overtime rate for the recorded overtime hours that they generated. In
4 addition to an hourly wage, Defendants paid Plaintiffs and Employees nondiscretionary
5 commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses. However, upon information and
6 belief, Defendants failed to incorporate all remunerations, including nondiscretionary
7 commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, into the calculation of the regular
8 rate of pay for purposes of calculating the overtime wage rate.

9 58. Therefore, during times when Plaintiffs and Employees worked overtime and
10 received nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses,
11 Defendants failed to pay all overtime wages by paying a lower overtime rate than required.

12 59. Defendants' failure to pay compensation in a timely fashion also constituted a
13 violation of California Labor Code § 204, which requires that all wages shall be paid
14 semimonthly. From four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit to the present, in direct
15 violation of that provision of the California Labor Code, Defendants have failed to pay all wages
16 and overtime compensation earned by Employees. Each such failure to make a timely payment of
17 compensation to Employees constitutes a separate violation of California Labor Code § 204.

18 60. Employees have been damaged by these violations of California Labor Code §§
19 204 and 510 (and the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission).

20 61. Consequently, pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 204, 510, and 1194 (and the
21 relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission), Defendants are liable to Employees for the
22 full amount of all their unpaid wages and overtime compensation, with interest, plus their
23 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

24 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **MEAL-PERIOD LIABILITY UNDER LABOR CODE § 226.7**

26 **(Against All Defendants)**

27 62. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporate all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
28 full herein.

63. Employees regularly worked shifts greater than five (5) hours and greater than ten (10) hours. Pursuant to Labor Code § 512 an employer may not employ someone for a shift of more than five (5) hours without providing him or her with a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes or for a shift of more than ten (10) hours without providing him or her with a second meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

64. Defendants had a common practice and policy of denying Plaintiff and Employees the opportunity to take 30-minute uninterrupted meal periods, in accordance with California Law. Specifically, Plaintiff and Employees were denied meal periods altogether. Moreover, as discussed above, Defendants had a common policy and practice of requiring plaintiff and Employees to complete work-related assignments during meal periods.

65. Moreover, Defendants failed to compensate Employees for each meal period not provided or inadequately provided, as required under Labor Code § 226.7. Additionally, as detailed above, when Defendants did pay meal period premiums, they did so at the normal regular rate of pay without factoring in all forms of remuneration/compensation or by otherwise incorrectly calculating the regular rate.

66. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one (1) hour of wages at their effective regular rates of pay for each meal period not provided or deficiently provided, a sum to be proven at trial.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REST-BREAK LIABILITY UNDER LABOR CODE § 226.7

(Against All Defendants)

67. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporate all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in full herein.

68. Employees consistently worked consecutive four (4) hour shifts. Pursuant to the Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Order, Employees were entitled to paid rest breaks of not less than ten (10) minutes for each consecutive four (4) hour shift.

69. Defendants have had a common policy and practice of consistently failing to provide Plaintiff and Employees with the opportunity to take paid rest breaks of not less than ten

(10) minutes for each consecutive four (4) hour shift. Plaintiff and Employees were required to work through their rest breaks, which were systemically denied due to demanding deadlines.

70. Moreover, Defendants did not compensate Employees with an additional hour of pay at each Employee's effective regular rate for each day that Defendants failed to provide them with adequate rest breaks, as required under Labor Code § 226.7. Additionally, as detailed above, when Defendants did pay rest period premiums, they did so at the normal regular rate of pay without factoring in all forms or remuneration/compensation or by otherwise incorrectly calculating the regular rate.

71. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one (1) hour of wages at their effective hourly rates of pay for each day worked without the required rest breaks, a sum to be proven at trial.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PAY VACATION WAGES
(Against All Defendants)

72. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in full herein.

73. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 227.3, whenever a contract of employment or employment policy provides for paid vacation and an employee is terminated without having taken off his vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to him as wages at his final rate in accordance with said contract of employment or policy respecting eligibility or time served.

74. Defendants paid nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses to Employees but Defendants failed to include these forms of remuneration in the regular rate of pay upon which vacation wages were calculated and paid.

75. Therefore, pursuant to, Plaintiff and Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 227.3.

//

//

//

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH LABOR CODE § 245 *ET SEQ.* AND 246**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 76. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
5 full herein.

6 77. California Labor Code § 245 *et seq.* requires that Defendants provide paid sick time
7 to Employees, including at the amount, terms, and rate of compensation set forth in said law. At
8 times relevant, Defendants have failed compute the amount due for paid sick time in conformance
9 with the pay calculation under California Labor Code § 246(1).

10 78. Defendants paid nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or
11 nondiscretionary bonuses to Employees but Defendants failed to include these forms of
12 remuneration in the regular rate of pay upon which sick pay was calculated and paid. Rather than
13 calculating the amount of paid sick time due when sick time is used according to the requirements
14 set forth in California Labor Code § 246(1), Defendants paid sick leave to Employees at a lower
15 rate, in violation of the law.

16 79. Therefore, Plaintiff and Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor
17 Code § 245 *et seq.* and §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246.

18 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE FOR NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENDITURES**

20 **IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 2802**

21 **(Against All Defendants)**

22 80. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporate all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
23 full herein.

24 81. Under Labor Code § 2802(a) an employer must indemnify its employees for all
25 necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge
26 of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

27 82. Employees incurred necessary expenditures in the performance of their job duties
28 for Defendants, namely the cost of cell phone usage and office supplies, which were necessary to

1 perform their duties under Defendants' employ. From four (4) years prior to the original filing of
2 this lawsuit and continuing to the present, Defendants consistently failed to reimburse Employees
3 for these necessarily incurred business expenses.

4 83. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Employees have been deprived of
5 reimbursement in amounts to be determined at trial; they are entitled to recovery of such amounts,
6 plus interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees, and costs.

7 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
8 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 226(a)**
9 **(Against All Defendants)**

10 84. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporate all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
11 full herein.

12 85. California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to furnish each of his or her
13 employees with an accurate, itemized statement in writing showing the gross and net earnings,
14 total hours worked, and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; these
15 statements must be appended to the detachable part of the check, draft, voucher, or whatever else
16 serves to pay the employee's wages; or, if wages are paid by cash or personal check, these
17 statements may be given to the employee separately from the payment of wages; in either case the
18 employer must give the employee these statements twice a month or each time wages are paid.

19 86. Defendants failed to provide Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in
20 writing, as required by the Labor Code. Specifically, the wage statements given to Employees by
21 Defendants failed to accurately account for wages, overtime, and premium pay for deficient meal
22 and rest periods, all of which Defendants knew or reasonably should have known were owed to
23 Employees, as alleged hereinabove. Moreover, Defendants failed to state their Employee
24 Identification, employee address, and regular and vacation pay rates on Plaintiff and Class
25 members' wage statements.

26 87. Furthermore, the wage statements given to Employees, by Defendants, failed to
27 include the above requirements enumerated above. Employees' wage statements did not include:
28 the total hours worked in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2) and failed to accurately set forth all

1 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
2 worked at each such rate in violation of Labor Code § 226 (a)(9). The wage statements provided to
3 Employees were confusing and required Employees to engage in discovery and refer to outside
4 sources to verify whether their pay was correct and potentially resulting in a miscalculation by the
5 Employees. Additionally, Specifically, Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep
6 accurate records of the correct overtime wages based on proper regular rate calculations that
7 included nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses earned,
8 and the total amount of compensation of their Employees. Moreover, the wage statements given to
9 Employees by Defendants failed to accurately account for wages, overtime, and premium pay for
10 deficient meal periods and rest breaks, all of which Defendants knew or reasonably should have
11 known were owed to Employees, as alleged hereinabove. The wage statements provided to
12 Employees were confusing and required Employees to engage in discovery and refer to outside
13 sources to verify whether their pay was correct and potentially resulting in a miscalculation by the
14 Employees.

15 88. Employees' wage statements did not include: the total hours worked in violation of
16 Labor Code § 226(a)(2) and failed to accurately set forth all applicable hourly rates in effect
17 during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each such rate in violation
18 of Labor Code § 226 (a)(9).

19 89. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 226(a),
20 Employees suffered injuries, including among other things confusion over whether they received
21 all wages owed them, the difficulty and expense involved in reconstructing pay records, and
22 forcing them to make mathematical computations to analyze whether the wages paid in fact
23 compensated them correctly for all hours worked.

24 90. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226(e), Employees are entitled to recover
25 the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation
26 occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not
27 exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000). They are also entitled to an
28 award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

91. With respect to violations of Labor Code § 226, Labor Code § 226.3 imposes a civil penalty of two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for initial violations for each employee for each pay period, and one thousand dollars (\$1000) for each subsequent violation for each employee for each pay period.

92. Plaintiff is seeking penalties against Defendants under Labor Code § 226.3, and any other applicable statute allowing recovery of penalties as alleged herein in an amount to be shown according to proof.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO KEEP REQUIRED PAYROLL RECORDS UNDER LABOR CODE §§ 1174

AND 1174.5

(Against All Defendants)

93. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporate all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in full herein.

94. California Labor Code § 1174 requires that all employers shall keep accurate time and wage records for all employees. California Labor Code § 1174.5 further requires that any employee suffering injury due to a willful violation of the aforementioned obligations may seek damages, including civil penalties, from the employer.

95. During the course of Plaintiff's and Employees' employment, Defendants consistently failed to maintain accurate time and wage records for Plaintiff and Employees as required by California Labor Code § 1174 by failing to pay Plaintiff and Employees proper wages, overtime, and premium pay as discussed above.

96. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for civil penalties pursuant to the California Labor Code §§ 1174.5. for the three (3) years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 203
(Against All Defendants)

97. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporate all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in full herein.

98. Numerous Employees are no longer employed by Defendants; they either quit Defendants' employ or were fired therefrom.

99. Defendants failed to pay these Employees all wages due and certain at the time of termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of resignation.

100. The wages withheld from these Employees by Defendants remained due and owing for more than thirty (30) days from the date of separation of employment.

101. Defendants' failure to pay wages, as alleged above, was willful in that Defendants knew wages to be due but failed to pay them; this violation entitles these Employees to penalties under Labor Code § 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue until paid for up to thirty (30) days from the date they were due.

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200 *ET SEQ.*

(Against All Defendants)

102. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporate all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in full herein.

103. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, Employees, and the general public, brings this claim pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* The conduct of Defendants as alleged in this Complaint has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Employees and the general public. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

104. Plaintiff is a “person” within the meaning of Business & Professions Code § 17204, has suffered injury, and therefore has standing to bring this cause of action for injunctive relief, restitution, and other appropriate equitable relief.

105. Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* prohibits unlawful and unfair business practices.

106. Wage-and-hour laws express fundamental public policies. Paying employees their wages and overtime, providing them with meal and rest periods, etc., are fundamental public policies of California. Labor Code § 90.5(a) articulates the public policies of this State vigorously

1 to enforce minimum labor standards, to ensure that employees are not required or permitted to
2 work under substandard and unlawful conditions, and to protect law-abiding employers and their
3 employees from competitors who lower costs to themselves by failing to comply with minimum
4 labor standards.

5 107. Defendants have violated statutes and public policies. Through the conduct alleged
6 in this Complaint Defendants have acted contrary to these public policies, have violated specific
7 provisions of the Labor Code, and have engaged in other unlawful and unfair business practices in
8 violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*; which conduct has deprived Plaintiff,
9 and all persons similarly situated, and all interested persons, of the rights, benefits, and privileges
10 guaranteed to all employees under the law.

11 108. Defendants' conduct, as alleged hereinabove, constitutes unfair competition in
12 violation of the Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

13 109. Defendants, by engaging in the conduct herein alleged, by failing to pay wages and
14 overtime, failing to provide meal and rest periods, etc., either knew or in the exercise of reasonable
15 care should have known that their conduct was unlawful; therefore their conduct violates the
16 Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

17 110. As a proximate result of the above-mentioned acts of Defendants, Employees have
18 been damaged, in a sum to be proven at trial.

19 111. Unless restrained by this Court Defendants will continue to engage in such
20 unlawful conduct as alleged above. Pursuant to the Business & Professions Code this Court should
21 make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to
22 prevent the use by Defendants or their agents or employees of any unlawful or deceptive practice
23 prohibited by the Business & Professions Code, including but not limited to the disgorgement of
24 such profits as may be necessary to restore Employees to the money Defendants have unlawfully
25 failed to pay.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
PENALTIES PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2698, *ET SEQ.*
(Against All Defendants)

112. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in full herein.

113. Plaintiff and the Employees in the Class are also aggrieved employees as defined under Labor Code § 2699(c) in that they suffered the violations alleged in this Complaint and either were or are employed by Defendants (“Aggrieved Employees”) during the relevant time period.

114. In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages and overtime, not providing proper meal and rest periods, failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and failing to pay Employees wages upon termination or timely upon resignation, all discussed above, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants also failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and paragraph 7 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

115. As such, Employees seek wages and penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699 for Defendants’ violation of Labor Code provisions included under Labor Code § 2699.5, including the penalty provisions, without limitation, based, inter alia, on the following California Labor Code sections: 201, 202, 203, 204, 206.5, 226, 226.2, 226.7, 432.5, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1185, 1194, 1194.1, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2802 and 2698 et seq.

116. More specifically, after complying with the notice procedures of Labor Code § 2699.3, Plaintiff asserts, as a representative action on behalf of the California Attorney General and the other similarly Aggrieved Employees, a PAGA claim for violations of the above-addressed underlying claims and seeking penalties as specified by the applicable corresponding provisions, including as follows:

(a) Wage Claims: For failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all earned regular pay and minimum wages for regular hours worked and for failure to pay overtime

1 premium wages for overtime hours worked under Labor Code §§ 226.2, 510, 1194(a), 1197, and
2 1198, and paragraphs 2(K), 3(A), 4(A), 4(B) and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking
3 all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable, and wages, under Labor Code §§ 510,
4 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant
5 to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

6 (b) Meal and Rest Period Claims: For failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
7 Employees off-duty, timely, and unpaid meal periods and failure to authorize and permit them to
8 take off-duty, timely, and paid rest periods, or pay one hour of regular pay in lieu thereof, under
9 Labor Code §§ 512, 1198, and 226.7, and Sections 11, 12(A), and 12(B) of the applicable IWC
10 Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable, including under
11 paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and wages under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512,
12 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs
13 pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

14 (c) Inaccurate Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Records: For failure to provide
15 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to
16 maintain employment records for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226,
17 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking
18 all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e),
19 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order,
20 and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by
21 providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor
22 Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor
23 Code §226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a
24 penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial
25 citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent
26 citation, ...";

27 (d) Failure to Timely Pay Wages: For failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at
28 least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204,

226.2, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable, and wages, under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(e) Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses: For Defendants' failure to reimburse the necessary work related expenses incurred under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802, and Sections 2(K), 4, 9, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), seeking civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, 2699.5, and 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 9 and 20 of the IWC Wage Orders, and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(f) All Alleged Violations of the IWC Wage Orders and Other Labor Code Sections: For any above addressed violation of the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage Orders, each of which constitute separate violations of Labor Code § 1198 and Labor Code § 2699.5, and seeking penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

117. As also addressed above, Plaintiff, on behalf of the Aggrieved Employees, also seeks the penalties and remedies set forth in Labor Code § 558, which states:

(a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages...

1 (b) If upon inspection or investigation the Labor Commissioner determines that a
2 person had paid or caused to be paid a wage for overtime work in violation of any provision of this
3 chapter, or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare
4 Commission, the Labor Commissioner may issue a citation. The procedures for issuing, contesting,
5 and enforcing judgments for citations or civil penalties issued by the Labor Commissioner for a
6 violation of this chapter shall be the same as those set out in Section 1197.1.
7

8 (c) The civil penalties provided for in this section are in addition to any other civil or
9 criminal penalty provided by law.

10 118. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies by submitting a certified letter
11 to the LWDA and Defendants on July 24, 2025 (LWDA-CM-111-4191-25) addressing in detail
12 the specific provisions of the Labor Code Defendants have violated and addressing the facts and
13 legal theories to support the alleged violations and requested penalties. The LWDA has not
14 provided notice of its intent to investigate the alleged violations within 65 calendar days of the
15 postmark date of the letter, and Plaintiff adds this claim seeking penalties under the PAGA for the
16 violations addressed herein and in the PAGA Notice letter and the original Complaint.
17

18 **RELIEF REQUESTED**

19 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

- 20 1. For an order certifying this action as a class action;
- 21 2. For compensatory damages in the amount of the unpaid minimum wages for work
22 performed by Employees and unpaid overtime compensation from at least four (4) years prior to
23 the filing of this action, as may be proven;
- 24 3. For liquidated damages in the amount equal to the unpaid minimum wage and
25 interest thereon, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action, according to proof;
- 26 4. For compensatory damages in the amount of the hourly wage made by Employees
27 for each missed or deficient meal period where no premium pay was paid therefor from four (4)
28 years prior to the filing of this action, as may be proven;

1 5. For compensatory damages in the amount of all unpaid wages, including overtime
2 and double-time pay, as may be proven;

3 6. For compensatory damages in the amount of the hourly wage made by Employees
4 for each day requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided where no
5 premium pay was paid therefor from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action, as may
6 be proven;

7 7. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e) for Employees, as may be proven;

8 8. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203 for all Employees who quit or were
9 fired in an amount equal to their daily wage times thirty (30) days, as may be proven;

10 9. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code §227.3, as may be proven;

11 10. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 245 and 246, as may be proven;

12 11. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, as may be proven;

13 12. For restitution for unfair competition pursuant to Business & Professions Code
14 § 17200 *et seq.*, including disgorgement or profits, as may be proven;

15 13. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*, as may be proven;

16 14. For penalties under Labor Code § 558, as may be proven;

17 15. For compensatory damages in the amount of all previously unreimbursed business
18 expenditures necessarily incurred by Employees in the discharge of their job duties for Defendants
19 from four (4) years prior to the original filing of this action, as may be proven;

20 16. For an order enjoining Defendants and their agents, servants, and employees, and
21 all persons acting under, in concert with, or for them, from acting in derogation of any rights or
22 duties adumbrated in this Complaint;

23 17. For all general, special, and incidental damages as may be proven;

24 18. For an award of pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;

25 19. For an award providing for the payment of the costs of this suit;

26 20. For an award of attorneys' fees; and

27 //

28 //

1 21. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem proper and just.

2 DATED: September 29, 2025

D.LAW, INC.

3

4

By 
Roman Shkodnik
Jean Hopkins Power
Attorneys for Plaintiff
JAIME HERNANDEZ
and the putative class

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands trial of her claims by jury to the extent authorized by law.

DATED: September 29, 2025

D.LAW, INC.

By 
Roman Shkodnik
Jean Hopkins Power
Attorneys for Plaintiff
JAIME HERNANDEZ
and the putative class

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

I am employed in the aforesaid county, State of California; I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action; my business address 450 N Brand Blvd., Suite 840, Glendale, CA 91203.

Saman Refua, *Agent for Service*
19500 Normandie Ave
Torrance, CA 90502

Saman Refua, *Agent for Service*
19500 Normandie Ave
Torrance, CA 90502

Denise M. Guzman, Agent for Service
111 N Sepulveda Blvd, Suite 250-22
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

[X] (BY MAIL) I placed such envelope with postage thereon fully paid in the United States mail at Glendale, California. I am "readily familiar" with this firm's practice of collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. It is deposited with U.S. Postal Service on that same day in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than 1 day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

[] (COURTESY COPY BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION) by use of email by scanning the documents and any and all documents and emailing them to email addresses above.

Executed on September 29, 2025, at Glendale, California.

Akiko Iwata
Akiko Iwata