

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)
Harita Nandivada, Esq. (SBN 338086)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
jklein@lelawfirm.com
hnandivada@lelawfirm.com

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
10/08/2025 4:18 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By S. Ruiz, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff TERESA MONTANO,
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT**

TERESA MONTANO, on behalf of herself and
current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

STUDIO CITY MAXWELL LLC; CULVER
CITY MAXWELL; and DOES 1 to 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **25STCV29496**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF TERESA MONTANO'S
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff TERESA MONTANO ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains
against Defendants STUDIO CITY MAXWELL LLC; CULVER CITY MAXWELL; and DOES 1
to 100, inclusive (collectively "Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*
("PAGA") representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California, herself
and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-exempt
employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated with

Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all hours worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant meal periods or pay meal period premium wages; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or pay rest period premium wages; failure to authorize and permit all legally required and legally compliant lactation accommodation breaks and/or failure to pay lactation accommodation penalties; statutory penalties for failure to timely pay earned wages during employment; statutory penalties for failure to provide accurate wage statements; statutory waiting time penalties in the form of continuation wages for failure to timely pay employees all wages due upon separation of employment. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout California, including but not limited to Los Angeles County, at 8379 W. 3rd St. Los Angeles, CA 90048.

III. PARTIES

1. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency on behalf of herself and other current and former employees subject to violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently

1 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by
2 Defendants in an hourly position from in or around 2019, until on or about April 2024.

3 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant STUDIO CITY
4 MAXWELL LLC is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business
5 in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-33 are, and at all times relevant hereto
6 were persons acting on behalf of Defendant STUDIO CITY MAXWELL LLC in the establishment
7 of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant
8 STUDIO CITY MAXWELL LLC operates in Los Angeles County and employed aggrieved
9 employees in Los Angeles County, including but not limited to, at 8379 W. 3rd St. Los Angeles,
10 CA 90048.

11 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant CULVER
12 CITY MAXWELL is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business
13 in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 34-66 are, and at all times relevant hereto
14 were persons acting on behalf of Defendant CULVER CITY MAXWELL in the establishment of,
15 or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant
16 CULVER CITY MAXWELL operates in Los Angeles County and employed aggrieved employees
17 in Los Angeles County, including but not limited to, at 8379 W. 3rd St. Los Angeles, CA 90048.

18 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 1
19 through 50 are corporations, or are other business entities or organizations of a nature unknown to
20 Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California non-exempt employees, permitted
21 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised control over the wages, hours and working
22 conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

23 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 51
24 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each of the individual defendants is sued
25 individually and in his or her capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner, representative, manager,
26 supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant who violated or caused to be
27 violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor Code and/or any provision of the
28 Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

1 6. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100. Plaintiff
2 sues said defendants by said fictitious names, and will amend this complaint when the true names
3 and capacities are ascertained or when such facts pertaining to liability are ascertained, or as
4 permitted by law or by the Court. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously
5 named defendants is in some manner responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this
6 complaint.

7 7. Plaintiff makes the allegations in this complaint without any admission that, as to
8 any particular allegation, Plaintiff bears the burden of pleading, proving, or persuading and Plaintiff
9 reserves all of Plaintiff's right to plead in the alternative.

10 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**
12 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

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

15 8. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

16 9. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges
17 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 510, 1030, 1031,
18 1033, 512, 1194, 1197, 1198, and the applicable Wage Orders.

19 10. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California
20 Labor Code:

21 11. **Failure to pay wages for all hours worked at the legal minimum wage:**
22 Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt
23 employees. In California, an employer is required to pay hourly employees for all "hours worked,"
24 which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the employee
25 is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either directly or
26 indirectly, performing services which inure to the benefit of the employer.

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

1 Wage Orders.

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

8 (a) Sometimes requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
9 based hourly non-exempt employees to work off the clock after clocking out for the end of their
10 shift to perform closing procedures such as, but not limited to, cleaning and taking out the trash.

11 (b) Sometimes requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
12 based hourly non-exempt employees to remain on-duty during their off-the-clock meal breaks
13 without being paid for that time.

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

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

27 16. Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 require an employer to compensate employees a
28 higher rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, in excess of forty (40)

1 hours in a workweek, and on any seventh consecutive day of work in a workweek:

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

10 Labor Code section 510.

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

14 (a) Sometimes requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
15 based hourly non-exempt employees to work off the clock after clocking out for the end of their
16 shift to perform closing procedures such as, but not limited to, cleaning and taking out the trash.

17 (b) Sometimes requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
18 based hourly non-exempt employees to remain on-duty during their off-the-clock meal breaks
19 without being paid for that time.

20 18. The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each
21 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
22 employees were under the control of Defendants but were not compensated. To the extent that the
23 foregoing uncompensated time occurred when Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
24 California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday,
25 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendants failed
26 to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code
27 sections 510, 1194 and 1198, and the applicable Wage Order.

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

1 shifts of more than ten (10) hours in length.

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

13 21. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
14 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay
15 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
16 sections 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 2 at §11.

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

21 (a) Sometimes failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
22 California-based hourly non-exempt employees timely, uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at
23 least 30 minutes for every five hours worked due to heavy workflow and understaffing.

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

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

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

9 26. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
10 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor Code
11 section 226.7; Wage Order 2 at §12. Under California law, "[e]mployees are entitled to 10 minutes'
12 rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six
13 hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on." *Brinker*
14 *Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code section 226.7;
15 Wage Order 2 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each work period.
16 Wage Order 2 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement "obligates employers to permit –
17 and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods." *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*,
18 (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all
19 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

20 27. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer must
21 pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday the
22 employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7; Wage
23 Order 2 at § 12.

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

28 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based

1 hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours worked
2 or major fraction thereof.

3 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
4 hourly non-exempt employees with a third uninterrupted duty-free rest period of no less than ten
5 (10) net minutes on each workday that Plaintiff and similarly situated employees work shifts over
6 ten (10) hours.

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

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

16 31. **Failure to authorize and permit all legally required and legally compliant**
17 **lactation accommodation breaks and/or failure to pay lactation accommodation penalties:**
18 Defendant often employed non-exempt employees, including the named Plaintiff and other current
19 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees, who desired to express breast
20 milk for the employees' infant children.

21 32. California law requires every employer to provide a reasonable amount of break time
22 to accommodate an employee's desire to express breast milk for the employee's infant child each
23 time the employee needs to express milk. California law also requires that an employer provide an
24 employee with a room or location for the employee to express milk in private which shall:

25 (a) not be a bathroom, shall be in close proximity to the employee's work area,
26 shielded from view and free from intrusion while the employee is expressing milk;

27 (b) shall be safe, clean, and free of hazardous materials as defined in Labor Code
28 section 6382;

1 (c) shall contain a surface to place a breast pump and personal items;
2 (d) shall contain a place to sit; and
3 (e) shall have access to electricity or alternative devices, including, but not
4 limited to, extension cords or charging stations, needed to operate an electric or battery-powered
5 breast pump.

6 33. California law also requires the employer provide access to a sink with running water
7 and a refrigerator suitable for storing milk in close proximity to the employee's workspace or other
8 suitable cooling device if a refrigerator cannot be provided. If an employer fails to provide reasonable
9 break time or adequate space to express milk, the employer must pay the employee an additional
10 hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday the adequate space or reasonable time
11 is not provided. (Lab. Code §§1033, subd. (a), 226.7, subd. (c).)

12 34. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
13 non-exempt employees of Defendants sought to express breast milk for the employees' infant
14 children; however, Defendants employed policies, practices, and/or procedures or lack of such
15 policies, practices, and/or procedures which resulted in its failure to provide Plaintiff and other
16 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees with reasonable break
17 time for lactation or a room which complied with the requirements of California law, including but
18 not limited to, the room not being private and shielded from view or free from intrusion while the
19 employee is expressing milk. For example, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
20 California-based hourly non-exempt employees were not provided time or space to express milk, or
21 a place to store expressed milk.

22 35. Additionally, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former
23 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees an additional hour of pay at their regular
24 rate of compensation for each workday the employees did not receive all legally required and
25 compliant lactation periods, i.e., legally compliant time or space. Defendants employed policies and
26 procedures which ensured that employees did not receive any lactation period premium wages to
27 compensate them for workdays in which they did not receive all legally required and compliant
28 lactation periods.

1 36. The aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures of Defendants resulted in
2 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not
3 being provided with all legally required and compliant lactation periods and/or not receiving
4 premium wages to compensate them for such instances, all in violation of California law.

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

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

21 39. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
22 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
23 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
24 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by
25 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful
26 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,
27 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor
28 Code section 1198, the Defendant secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while

1 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

2 40. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section
3 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an employee
4 his or her wages, the employer must “furnish each of his or her employees ... an itemized statement
5 in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any
6 employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
7 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare
8 Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
9 is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all deductions made on written orders
10 of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive
11 dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her
12 social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all
13 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
14 worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

15 41. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff
16 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
17 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period
18 premium wages) rendered Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based
19 hourly non-exempt employees’ wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section
20 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

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

25 43. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, because Defendants failed to pay
26 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all
27 their earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages,
28 and/or rest period premium wages), Defendants failed to pay those employees timely after each

1 employee's termination and/or resignation, in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

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

6 45. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
7 section 2699.3. On July 24, 2025, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and
8 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of
9 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
10 violations alleged.

11 46. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by
12 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code
13 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the
14 parties notice within 60 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends
15 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

16 47. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
17 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7,
18 510, 512, 1194, and 1198., During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present,
19 preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the
20 following amounts:

21 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, and 1198;
22 one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and
23 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent
24 violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

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

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

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

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

15 48. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g), Plaintiff is entitled to an award of
16 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with her claims for civil penalties.

17 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

18 **WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HERSELF AND ON OTHER AGGRIEVED**
19 **EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:**

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

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

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

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

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

1 appropriate.

2

3

4 Dated: October 8, 2025

5

6

By:

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP



7

Joseph Lavi, Esq.

8

Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.

9

Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.

10

Harita Nandivada, Esq.

11

Attorneys for Plaintiff

12

TERESA MONTANO

13

on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved
employees

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28