

Nathan D Ide
Judicial Officer, Assigned for All Purposes

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

Sarah H. Cohen (Cal. Bar No. 330700)

sarah@tomorrowlaw.com

Lizette A. Rodriguez (Cal. Bar No. 335182)

lizette@tomorrowlaw.com

1460 Westwood Boulevard

Los Angeles, California 90024

Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

Attorneys for Plaintiff CUTBERTO MUNOZ,
as an Aggrieved Employee, and on behalf of all other
Aggrieved Employees

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF TULARE

CUTBERTO MUNOZ, as an Aggrieved
Employee, and on behalf of all other
Aggrieved Employees under the Labor Code
Private Attorneys' General Act of 2004,

Plaintiff

v.

HORIZON NUT LLC, a California limited
liability company; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of Tulare
05/27/2026
By: Sofia Bravo Zapien,
Deputy Clerk

Case Management Conference

09/28/2026 08:30 AM - Department 09

To obtain an ADR packet please visit the court's website.
<https://www.tulare.courts.ca.gov/divisions/civil>

CASE NO.: VCU335477

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

**COMPLAINT UNDER THE LABOR
CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS'
GENERAL ACT OF 2004 FOR CIVIL
PENALTIES UNDER LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1
and 2699**

[Amount in Controversy Greater Than
\$35,000.00]

1 Plaintiff CUTBERTO MUNOZ (“Plaintiff”), as an Aggrieved Employee, and on behalf of
2 all other Aggrieved Employees under the Labor Code Private Attorneys’ General Act of 2004,
3 alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 1. This is a representative action, pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General
6 Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”), against HORIZON NUT LLC,
7 a California limited liability company, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies
8 within the State of California (“HORIZON NUT” hereinafter, collectively, with DOES 1 through
9 100, as further defined below, “Defendants”) as a proxy of the Labor and Workforce Development
10 Agency of the State of California (“LWDA”), on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees
11 that worked for Defendants during the PAGA Period. Specifically, in connection with any alleged
12 claims for failure to comply with Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 432.5,
13 1198, 1198.5, and applicable Wage Orders, Plaintiff seeks to represent all current and former
14 employees that worked for Defendants during the PAGA Period. On all other claims mentioned
15 herein, Plaintiff seeks to represent only non-exempt current and former employees that worked for
16 Defendants during the PAGA Period. Collectively, these employees are herein referred to as
17 “Aggrieved Employees.” The “PAGA Period” refers to one year preceding the date notice was
18 submitted to the LWDA, continuing past the date of notice to the LWDA into perpetuity.

19 **PARTIES**

20 2. Plaintiff CUTBERTO MUNOZ is a resident of the State of California. At all relevant
21 times herein, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
22 employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee with duties that included, but were not limited to,
23 fixing machines as needed. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
24 Plaintiff CUTBERTO MUNOZ worked for Defendants from approximately January of 2019
25 through approximately April of 2025.

26 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant
27 HORIZON NUT is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and
28 existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County

1 of Tulare, State of California. At all relevant times herein, HORIZON NUT employed Plaintiff and
2 Aggrieved Employees within the State of California

3 4. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise,
4 of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff,
5 who therefore sues defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474.
6 Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the defendants designated
7 herein as DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein.
8 Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of
9 the defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known.

10 **JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS**

11 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each defendant
12 acted in all respects pertinent to this action, as the agent of the other defendant(s), carried out a joint
13 scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are
14 legally attributable to the other defendants. Whenever, heretofore or hereinafter, reference is made
15 to "Defendants," it shall include HORIZON NUT, and any of their parent, subsidiary, or affiliated
16 companies within the State of California, as well as DOES 1 through 100 identified herein.

17 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that all the times
18 mentioned herein, each of the Defendants was the agent, principal, employee, employer,
19 representative, joint venture or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, either actually or
20 ostensibly, and in doing the things alleged herein acted within the course and scope of such agency,
21 employment, joint venture, and conspiracy.

22 7. All of the acts and conduct described herein of each and every corporate defendant
23 was duly authorized, ordered, and directed by the respective and collective defendant corporate
24 employers, and the officers and management-level employees of said corporate employers. In
25 addition thereto, said corporate employers participated in the aforementioned acts and conduct of
26 their said employees, agents, and representatives, and each of them; and upon completion of the
27 aforesaid acts and conduct of said corporate employees, agents, and representatives, the defendant
28 corporation respectively and collectively ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded,

1 acquiesced, authorized, and otherwise approved of each and all of the said acts and conduct of the
2 aforementioned corporate employees, agents and representatives.

3 8. As a result of the aforementioned facts, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based
4 thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are joint employers.

5 **JURISDICTION**

6 9. Jurisdiction exists in the Superior Court of the State of California pursuant to Code
7 of Civil Procedure section 410.10.

8 10. Venue is proper in Tulare County, California pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure
9 sections 392, *et seq.* because, among other things, Tulare County is where the causes of action
10 complained of herein arose; the county in which the employment relationship began; the county in
11 which performance of the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff and Defendants was
12 due to be performed; the county in which the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff
13 and Defendants was actually performed; and the county in which Defendants, or some of them,
14 reside. Moreover, the unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and Aggrieved
15 Employees in Tulare County, and Defendants employ Aggrieved Employees in Tulare County.

16 **PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ALLEGATIONS**

17 11. Plaintiff is an "Aggrieved Employee" under PAGA, as Plaintiff was employed by
18 Defendants during the PAGA Period and suffered the Labor Code violations set forth herein, even
19 if not in the precise exact fashion as other Aggrieved Employees. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to
20 recover civil penalties under PAGA, plus reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, for Plaintiff and all
21 other Aggrieved Employees of Defendants during the PAGA Period.

22 12. Specifically, Plaintiff seeks to recover PAGA civil penalties through a representative
23 action permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in, among other authorities, *Arias v.*
24 *Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969. According to the same authorities, class certification of the
25 PAGA allegations described herein is not required.

26 13. Labor Code section 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g), authorizes Aggrieved Employees
27 such as Plaintiff to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures specified
28 in Labor Code section 2699.3 on behalf of Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved Employees within the

1 PAGA Period.

2 14. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, on or around July 23, 2025, Plaintiff
3 provided written notice of Defendants' violation of various provisions of the Labor Code to the
4 LWDA online and by certified mail, with return receipt requested, to Defendants ("PAGA Notice").

5 15. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a)(2)(A), the LWDA did not
6 provide notice of its intention to investigate Defendants' alleged violations within sixty-five (65)
7 calendar days of the PAGA Notice.

8 16. To the extent Defendants, or either of them, previously used the notice and cure
9 provision of Labor Code section 2699.3 within the last twelve months, under section 2699.3(d), then
10 Defendants, or those who have availed themselves of the cure provisions validly, are not eligible to
11 cure the violations discussed herein under section 2699.3 or otherwise use the early evaluation
12 conference process pursuant to section 2699.3(f).

13 17. In the event that Defendants, or either of them, is/are determined to have satisfied
14 sections 2699(g), 2699(h), or otherwise 2699(d)(1), Defendants, or any that is determined to have
15 satisfied sections 2699(g), 2699(h), is also, in the alternative, liable for civil penalties pursuant to
16 Labor Code sections 2699(j), 2699(e)(2), and 2699(f)(2).

17 18. In the event that Defendants, or either of them, is/are determined to have, prior to
18 this notice or a request for records pursuant to Labor Code section 226, 432, or 1198.5, from Plaintiff
19 and/or Plaintiff's counsel, adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all
20 provisions identified in this notice, said defendant(s) is/are still liable for civil penalties pursuant to
21 section 2699(g)(1)-(3).

22 19. In the event that Defendants, or either of them is/are deemed to have adequately taken
23 all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice within sixty (60)
24 days of receiving this notice, said defendant(s) is/are still liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor
25 Code section 2699(h)(1)-(3).

26 20. In the event, the LWDA and/or a court issued a finding or determination to the
27 Defendants, or either of them, that within five (5) years preceding the date of the PAGA Notice the
28 policies or practices which gave rise to the violations alleged herein were unlawful, Defendants, or

1 any of them, would be subject to heightened penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections
2 2699(f)(2)(B)(i), 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3) and **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either
3 Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h) for remedying violations either prior to or after the serving
4 of the PAGA Notice. Regardless, Plaintiff alleges Defendants' conduct giving rise to the violations
5 as detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. Thus, Defendants, or any of
6 them, are further subject to increased penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii) and lack
7 eligibility for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h).

8 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

9 21. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew,
10 or should have known, that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to receive wages for all
11 time worked, including regular, overtime, and double times wages, and that Plaintiff and Aggrieved
12 Employees were not receiving all wages owed for work that was required to be performed.

13 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had
14 and have a policy or practice of requiring Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to work more
15 than eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a
16 workweek (in violation of Labor Code sections 551 and 552) without paying them proper overtime
17 wages.

18 23. Upon information and belief, Defendants failed to accurately track and/or pay for all
19 minutes actually worked by Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees at the proper rates of pay.
20 Defendants also engaged, suffered, or permitted Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock,
21 including, without limitation, by requiring Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to come early to work
22 and leave late for work without being able to clock in for all that time, to suffer under Employer's
23 control due to long lines for clocking in, to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-
24 shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue working; and failing to
25 include all forms of remuneration, including non-discretionary bonuses, incentive pay, and other
26 forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the pay periods where overtime was worked
27 and the additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay.
28

1 In addition, Defendants failed to pay at the proper overtime include all forms of remuneration into
2 the regular rate of pay for the pay periods where overtime was worked and the additional
3 compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay, given Plaintiff's
4 paystubs include earning received as "Bonus", and there are shift differential issues.

5 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
6 violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 223, 510, 551, 552, 1197, 1182.12, and applicable
7 Wage Orders based on its continued failure to pay minimum and overtime wages for all hours
8 worked. Thus, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to actual and liquidated
9 damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections, 1194, 1194.2, and 1198. Plaintiff is further
10 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such
11 violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendants would also be liable for civil
12 penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1197.1,
13 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Defendants would further
14 be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

15 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants, and
16 each of them, had and have a policy or practice of compelling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
17 Employees during the PAGA Period to work every day in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per
18 day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or
19 compensation in lieu thereof. By way of example, Defendants regularly denied Plaintiff and
20 Aggrieved Employees lawful meal periods by, without limitation, failure to provide a suitable break
21 area; by interrupting meal periods; not providing timely meal periods; failing to provide first and
22 second meal periods; providing short meal periods, including without, limitation meal periods that
23 were recorded for less than thirty minutes, and meal periods that may appear on the record to be
24 thirty minutes or longer but in practice were shorter than thirty minutes; and not permitting
25 employees to leave the premises. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these
26 violations. Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
27 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 512 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee
28 during the PAGA Period, and thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay

1 at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section
2 226.7. However, Plaintiff is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code
3 section 226.7 were not made for these non-compliant meal periods, either at all or at the proper
4 regular rate of pay. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code
5 sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize
6 the taking of compliant meal periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code
7 section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further
8 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct that gave rise to such
9 violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such, Defendants are further liable for
10 civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

11 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
12 maintain policies or practices of compelling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees every day to,
13 including, without limitation, work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without
14 authorizing and permitting Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted, timely,
15 and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the employees are completely relieved of all of their
16 duties. By way of example, Defendants regularly denied Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees lawful
17 rest periods by, without limitation, by failing to provide rest periods all together; failing to provide
18 a suitable rest facility; failing to provide rest periods that were at least ten minutes in length,
19 including rest periods that were shorter than ten minutes, or rest periods that may have encompassed
20 a total of ten minutes but were in practice less than ten uninterrupted minutes; interrupting them;
21 and not permitting employees to leave the premises. Further, Defendants failed to provide third rest
22 breaks when Plaintiff worked in excess of 10 hours. Defendants failed to provide premium pay for
23 these violations. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations.
24 Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
25 violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA
26 Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular
27 rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7.
28 However, Plaintiff is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section

1 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant rest periods, either at all or at the proper regular
2 rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198. Defendants would thus be liable
3 for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558,
4 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to
5 provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1)
6 and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants'
7 conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such,
8 Defendants are further liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

9 27. As a result of, among other things, Defendants' herein-described policy or practice
10 of failing to: accurately record time; failing to pay overtime and minimum wages; failing to provide
11 meal periods; failing to provide rest periods; and failing to provide compensation in lieu of meal or
12 rest periods, as described above, and due to independent failures in connection therewith, Plaintiff
13 is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants also intentionally failed and
14 continues to fail to furnish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements that
15 accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; the
16 inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; the name of the employee and only the
17 last four digits of their social security number or an employee identification number other than a
18 social security number; all deductions; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
19 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee; the legal name and
20 address of the employer, and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226,
21 subdivision (a). Specifically, Defendants intentionally failed to furnish employees with itemized
22 wage statements that accurately reflect the hours worked by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
23 Employees and the rates of pay at which they were or should have been paid including due to failure
24 to pay at the proper regular rate, thus resulting in a failure to reflect gross and net wages earned and
25 paid at each rate, as well. Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon
26 alleges, that Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226, and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved
27 Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Plaintiff and each Aggrieved Employee
28 personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 226 for each

1 pay period worked during the PAGA Period. Plaintiff is informed and believes that those penalties
2 under Labor Code section 226 were not paid for these violations of Labor Code section 226.
3 Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558,
4 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further
5 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such
6 violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Thus, Defendants would further be liable
7 for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

8 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants also
9 willfully or intentionally failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to timely pay
10 compensation to Plaintiff and other terminated or resigned employees, including but not limited to,
11 failing to pay all overtime wages owed, including for failure to pay at overtime the proper rate of
12 pay; all minimum wages; all premium pay owed; and all paid sick leave, as set forth above, among
13 other things. Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
14 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202 203, and 1198 each pay period for each
15 Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and thus Plaintiff and each Aggrieved Employee
16 personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 203 for each
17 pay period worked during the PAGA Period. However, Plaintiff is informed and believes that those
18 penalties under Labor Code section 203 were not made for these violations of Labor Code sections
19 201, 202, and 203. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code
20 sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(j). Plaintiff is
21 further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise
22 to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such, Defendants would further
23 be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

24 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants also
25 failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without
26 limitation, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for laundering
27 mandatory uniforms, in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to
28 the directions of Defendants, as required by Labor Code sections 1198, 2800, 2802, and other

1 statutory and common law offenses. As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees have
2 personally suffered these violations and Defendants are liable to reimburse Plaintiff and other
3 Aggrieved Employees for these costs incurred in furtherance of work duties. Defendants would thus
4 be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief
5 under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon
6 alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent,
7 or oppressive. As such, Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor
8 Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

9 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants had and
10 have a policy or practice of failing to pay Aggrieved Employees their wages in accordance with
11 Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days,
12 inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during
13 which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of
14 any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Plaintiff
15 is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants did not and do not pay Plaintiff
16 and other Aggrieved Employees all wages owed every day and every workweek in accordance with
17 Labor Code sections 204 and 1198. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges,
18 that Defendants violated Labor Code section 204 and that Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees
19 have personally suffered these violations. As such, Defendants would be liable for civil penalties
20 pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections
21 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
22 Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or
23 oppressive. Therefore, Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code
24 section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

25 31. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
26 have or had a policy or practice of failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with
27 all rights afforded to them under the Healthy Workplace Healthy Families Act of 2014, codified at
28 Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*, including, without limitation, the amount of paid sick leave required

1 to be provided pursuant to California and local laws. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that
2 the sick pay was not provided at the proper regular of pay as required under California law due to
3 failure to properly calculate the regular rate. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that
4 Defendants also did not permit its use upon request by Defendants and other Aggrieved Employees
5 as contemplated under California and local laws, including, without limitation, under Labor Code
6 section 233, that permits its use to attend to an illness of a child, parent, spouse, or domestic partner
7 without retaliation. Plaintiff is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of
8 Labor Code section 221, 223, 233, 234, 245 and 246 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace
9 injury reporting. Plaintiff is thus informed and believes that Defendants violated these Labor Code
10 sections, as well as Labor Code section 1198. As such, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees
11 have personally suffered violations under these sections and Defendants would be liable for civil
12 penalties for violation of the paid sick leave regulations under Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699,
13 as well as equitable, injunctive, or restitutionary relief, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.
14 Plaintiff further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above
15 gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendants would further
16 be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

17 32. In addition to the above, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges
18 that Defendants failed and continue to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage
19 statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to
20 obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code
21 section 1198.5, time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Plaintiff and
22 other Aggrieved Employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Plaintiff
23 and the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, which in turn would entitle
24 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and
25 1198.5. Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558,
26 1174.5, and 2699. Plaintiff further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
27 Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or
28

1 oppressive. Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
2 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

3 33. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants
4 failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to comply with the notice requirements of Labor
5 Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing
6 to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay
7 applicable to their employment; any allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage; the regular
8 payday designated by Defendants; the name of the employer, including any “doing business as”
9 names used by the employer; the physical address of the employer’s main office and the telephone
10 number of the employer; the name, address and telephone number of the workers’ compensation
11 insurance carrier; information regarding paid sick leave; and other pertinent information required to
12 be disclosed by Defendants under Labor Code section 2810.5. Plaintiff is informed and believes that
13 Defendants’ failure to provide such information, including rates of pay that are in effect, has
14 permitted Defendants to pay employees at rates of pay that were not agreed upon and violate
15 minimum wage and overtime wage laws in California. Plaintiff is informed and believes that
16 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1198 and 2810.5. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
17 Employees personally suffered these violations. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based
18 thereon alleges, that Defendants’ conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious,
19 fraudulent, or oppressive. Among other relief, employees may collect from Defendants in
20 connection with these violations’ civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and
21 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Defendants would further be liable
22 for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

23 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants,
24 including their agents, managers, superintendents, and/or officers, required Plaintiff and/or
25 Aggrieved Employees to agree, in writing, to terms and conditions known by Defendants (and its
26 agents, managers, superintendents and/or officers) to be prohibited by law, including, without
27 limitation, terms known to be illegal in purported arbitration agreements, and other written
28 documents presented for signature and/or assent to Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees by

1 Defendants. Defendants also required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to inform prospective
2 employers of Defendants' restrictions of Plaintiff's and Aggrieved Employees' freedom to work.
3 As a result, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants violated Labor Code sections 432.5
4 and 1198. As such, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Plaintiff and
5 other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Defendants violated,
6 without limitation, Labor Code section 432.5 and Government Code section 12952, entitling
7 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to damages. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and
8 based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was
9 malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to
10 Labor Code sections 432.5, 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and
11 2699(k). Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
12 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

13 35. Plaintiff, in Plaintiff's representative capacity, seeks civil penalties under Labor
14 Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699 for the herein-described acts, which violate
15 the California Labor Code as described above, including on behalf of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
16 Employees pursuant to PAGA.

17 **FIRST AND ONLY CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **(Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys' General Act (2004) – Against All Defendants)**

19 36. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations set forth in the
20 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

21 **Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 210**

22 37. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 204, requires and required that:
23 “[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for
24 between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor
25 performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for
26 between the 1st and 10th day of the following month.”

27 38. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a) states and stated
28 that “[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this

1 article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3,
2 204, 204b, 204.1, 205, 205.5, and 1197.5, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any
3 initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee” and “(2) For
4 each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for
5 each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.”

6 39. At all relevant times herein, Defendants have had a consistent policy or practice of
7 failing to pay Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees during their employment on a timely basis as
8 per Labor Code section 204 including, without limitation, for the reasons and in a manner set forth
9 in the preceding paragraphs. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 210, Plaintiff and other
10 Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover as civil penalties injunctive relief and monetary civil
11 penalties in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial
12 violation per employee, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus
13 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent
14 violation in connection with each payment that was made in violation of Labor Code section 204.

15 Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 226.3

16 40. Labor Code section 226.3 states that “[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a)
17 of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250)
18 per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for
19 each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage
20 deduction statement or fails to keep the records required in subdivision (a) of Section 226.”

21 41. Labor Code section 226.3 further provides that “[t]he civil penalties provided for in
22 this section are in addition to any other penalty provided by law.”

23 42. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had
24 and have a policy or practice of failing to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by
25 intentionally failing to furnish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements
26 that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total hours worked; net wages earned; the name and
27 address of each employer with whom they have been placed to work; all applicable hourly rates in
28 effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; the

1 legal name of the employer; and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226,
2 subdivision (a).

3 43. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.3, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are
4 entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants' violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision
5 (a) in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period
6 for the initial violation, and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay
7 period for each subsequent violation.

8 Violation of Labor Code § 558

9 44. Pursuant to Labor Code section 558, subdivision (a): "Any employer or other person
10 acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated . . . any provision regulating
11 hours and days of work in any of the Industrial Welfare Commission" shall be subject to a civil
12 penalty as follows:

13 (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee and for each
14 pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient
15 to recover underpaid wages;

16 (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid
17 employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to
18 an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages;

19 (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee."

20 45. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants, and
21 each of them, violated, or caused to be violated, the Labor Code sections and Wage Orders
22 regulating wages, hours and days of work described herein, including but not limited to Labor Code
23 sections 201-204, 223, 226.7, 510, 511, 512, 551, 552, 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2802.

24 46. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
25 pursuant to Labor Code section 558, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover
26 civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount fifty dollars
27 (\$50) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars
28 (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

Violation of Labor Code § 1174.5

47. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (b) has required every person employing labor in California to “[a]llow any member of the commission or the employees of the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement free access to the place of business or employment of the person to secure any information or make any investigation that they are authorized by this chapter to ascertain or make. The commission may inspect or make excerpts, relating to the employment of employees, from the books, reports, contracts, payrolls, documents, or papers of the person.”

48. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (c) has required every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep a record showing the names and addresses of all employees employed and the ages of all minors.”

49. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d) has required every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units earned.”

50. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, “[a]ny person employing labor who willfully fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of [Labor Code] Section 1174 or accurate and complete records required by subdivision (d) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, or to allow any member of the commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to subdivision (b) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).

51. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants have willfully failed to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment

1 under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records
2 under Labor Code section 1174.

3 52. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
4 pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
5 recover civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of five
6 hundred dollars (\$500) per violation per pay period per Aggrieved Employee.

7 Violation of Labor Code § 1197.1

8 53. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, subdivision (a): "Any employer or other
9 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, who pays
10 or causes to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or
11 local law, or by an order of the commission shall be subject to a civil penalty, restitution of wages,
12 liquidated damages payable to the employee, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
13 Section 203 as follows:

14 (1) For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars
15 (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
16 employee is underpaid. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
17 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
18 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

19 (2) For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty
20 dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
21 employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is
22 intentionally committed. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
23 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
24 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

25 (3) Wages, liquidated damages, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
26 Section 203, recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected
27 employee."

28 ///

1 54. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants caused
2 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees not to be paid minimum wages as a result of Defendants
3 routinely failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked by Plaintiff and
4 Aggrieved Employees at the proper rates of pay, as described above.

5 55. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
6 pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
7 recover civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of one
8 hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and
9 two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each
10 subsequent violation.

11 Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 2699

12 56. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), notwithstanding any other
13 provision of law, any provision of the Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed
14 and collected by the LWDA or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or
15 employees for a violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil
16 action brought by an Aggrieved Employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former
17 employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

18 57. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and
19 each of them, violated the Labor Code sections described in the preceding paragraphs.

20 58. As such, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to injunctive relief, one
21 hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee for each pay period in the PAGA Period, and
22 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each Aggrieved Employee for each pay period in the PAGA Period
23 to the extent Defendants' conduct is found to be malicious, fraudulent and/or oppressive.

24 59. Moreover, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees within the State of California
25 whom Plaintiff seeks to represent are entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in
26 connection with their herein-described claims for civil penalties.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **PRAYER**

2 **WHEREFORE**, on behalf of Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff prays for
3 judgment against Defendants as follows:

- 4 A. An award of civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558,
5 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
- 6 B. An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections
7 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
- 8 C. For equitable, including, without limitation, injunctive relief;
- 9 C. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;
- 10 D. For costs of suit incurred herein; and
- 11 E. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

12 Dated: May 27, 2026

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

13
14 BY: /s/ Lizette A. Rodriguez

15 SARAH H. COHEN

16 LIZETTE A. RODRIGUEZ

17 Attorneys for Plaintiff CUTBERTO MUNOZ
18 and on behalf of all other Aggrieved
19 Employees
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28