

1 Seung L. Yang (SBN 249857)
E-mail: seung.yang@thesentinel-firm.com
2 Tiffany Hyun (SBN 311743)
E-mail: tiffany.hyun@thesentinel-firm.com
3 Andrew Weaver (SBN 318935)
E-Mail: andrew.weaver@thesentinel-firm.com
4 **THE SENTINEL FIRM, APC**
707 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 4700
5 Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 985-1150
6 Facsimile: (213) 985-2155

7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Tiffany Ann Stewart and Joshua Telehala-Courtney

8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
9 **FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA**

11 TIFFANY ANN STEWART and JOSHUA
12 TELEHALA-COURTNEY, individually, and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 vs.

16 LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL
17 SECURITY, LLC, a Delaware limited liability
company; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

18 Defendants

Case No.: 25CV129909

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197];
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Compensation [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198];
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512];
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Breaks [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7];
5. Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses [Cal. Lab. Code § 2802];
6. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203];
7. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements [Cal. Lab. Code § 226]; and
8. Unfair Business Practices [Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.].

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL



05/27/2026

Chad Finke, Executive Officer / Clerk of the Court

By: D. Drew Deputy

1 Plaintiffs Tiffany Ann Stewart and Joshua Telehala-Courtney (together, “Plaintiffs”),
2 based upon facts that either have evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary support
3 after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation and discovery, allege as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiffs bring this action against Defendant Lawrence Livermore National
6 Security, LLC and Does 1 through 10 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California
7 Labor Code violations and unfair business practices stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay
8 minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to
9 authorize and permit rest periods, failure to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal
10 periods, failure to timely pay all wages to terminated employees, failure to indemnify necessary
11 business expenses, and failure to furnish accurate wage statements.

12 2. Plaintiffs bring the First through Eighth Causes of Action individually and as a
13 class action on behalf of themselves and certain current and former employees of Defendants
14 (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members” and defined more fully
15 below). The Class consists of Plaintiffs and all other persons who have been employed by any
16 Defendants in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee during the statute of
17 limitations period applicable to the claims pleaded here, but does not include any non-exempt
18 employee whose employment was covered by a collective bargaining agreement.

19 3. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
20 establishment within the State of California, including Alameda County. As such, and based
21 upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants’ business in California, Defendants
22 are subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare
23 Commission (“IWC”), and the California Business & Professions Code.

24 4. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period Defendants
25 maintained a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 26 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum
27 wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code
28 and IWC Wage Orders;

- 1 (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in
2 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing
3 to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and
4 failing to pay an additional hour's pay at the regular rate of pay for each
5 workday a meal period violation occurred;
- 6 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
7 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
8 Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay at the employee's
9 regular rate of pay for each workday a rest period violation occurred;
- 10 (d) Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred;
- 11 (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, overtime wages,
12 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages due within
13 the time period specified by California law when employment terminates;
- 14 (f) Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked;
15 and
- 16 (g) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements
17 containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and
18 IWC Wage Orders.

19 5. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and
20 constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their
21 unlawful policies. Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein
22 were willful and deliberate.

23 6. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the
24 unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the
25 foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiffs and the Class. Further, Defendants are
26 responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine
27 of "respondeat superior".
28

THE PARTIES

Plaintiffs

7. Plaintiff Stewart is a California resident that worked for Defendants in the County of Alameda, State of California, as an hourly, non-exempt Administrator and Tour Guide since approximately June 2020.

8. Plaintiff Telehala Courtney is a California resident that worked for Defendants in the County of Alameda, State of California, as an hourly, non-exempt Chemical Laboratory Technician from approximately August 2023 to November 2025.

9. Plaintiffs reserve the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v. American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

Defendants

10. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based upon that information and belief allege, that Defendant Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC is:

- (a) A Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Livermore, California;
- (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Alameda; and
- (c) The former and current employer of Plaintiffs, and the current and/or former employer of the putative Class. Defendant suffered and permitted Plaintiffs and the Class to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

11. Plaintiffs do not currently know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by Plaintiffs and the Class as alleged herein. Plaintiffs will amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

1 12. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and
2 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of,
3 and/or injured a significant number of the Plaintiffs and the Class in the State of California.

4 13. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at all relevant times
5 each Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiffs
6 and the other employees described in the class definitions below, and exercised control over
7 their wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon
8 allege that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer,
9 officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in
10 interest and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged
11 with some or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other
12 relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with
13 respect to the matters alleged below. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that
14 each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that
15 each Defendant knew or should have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved,
16 controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

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

18 14. Plaintiff Stewart is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County
19 of Alameda, State of California, as an Administrator and Tour Guide during the statutory period.
20 Plaintiff Telehala-Courtney is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of
21 Alameda, State of California, as a Chemical laboratory Technician during the statutory period.
22 Plaintiffs were typically scheduled to work 5 days in a workweek, and typically in excess of 8
23 hours in a single workday.

24 15. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs for all hours
25 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiffs with
26 uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs to take uninterrupted rest
27 periods, failed to indemnify Plaintiffs for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all
28 final wages to Plaintiffs when Defendants terminated Plaintiffs' employment, and failed to

1 furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiffs. As discussed below, Plaintiffs' experience
2 working for Defendants was typical and illustrative.

3 16. Throughout the statutory period, Plaintiffs and the Class worked more than 8
4 hours in a workday and more than 40 hours in a workweek. Defendants maintained a policy and
5 practice of not paying Plaintiffs and the Class for all hours worked, including all overtime
6 wages. In those instances where Plaintiffs and the Class earned non-discretionary bonuses and
7 other remuneration, Defendants failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the
8 correct overtime rate of pay, meal break premium rate of pay, rest break premium rate of pay,
9 and sick day rate of pay. Defendants also regularly used a system of time rounding in a manner
10 that resulted, over a period of time, in failing to compensate Plaintiffs and the Class properly for
11 all the time they have actually worked, even though the realities of Defendants' operations are
12 such that it is possible, practical, and feasible to count and pay for work time to the minute.
13 Also throughout the statutory period, Plaintiffs and the Class were required to work "off-the-
14 clock" and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiffs and the Class were required to discuss work-
15 related issues with their supervisors after their scheduled hours but were not compensated for this
16 additional time worked. Additionally, Defendants would often record Plaintiffs and the Class'
17 scheduled hours rather than actual time worked, despite Plaintiffs and the Class working before
18 and after scheduled hours and during meal periods. Further, Plaintiffs and the Class were required
19 to wear their company radios at all times, including during meal periods, and were required to
20 respond to work requests from supervisors while clocked out during purported meal periods.
21 Despite being required to perform these work tasks, Plaintiffs and the Class were not
22 compensated for this time worked. In maintaining a practice of not paying all wages owed,
23 Defendants failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiffs and the Class worked.

24 17. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to provide
25 Plaintiffs and the Class with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants often required
26 Plaintiffs and the Class to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing 30-
27 minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or
28 without compensating Plaintiffs and the Class for meal periods that were not provided by the

1 end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not adequately inform
2 Plaintiffs and the Class of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work,
3 or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Plaintiffs and the Class
4 were often required to work during their meal periods, leading to the failure to provide
5 uninterrupted meal periods. For example, Plaintiffs and the Class were required to prioritize
6 urgent work tasks before starting their meal periods or during their meal periods, resulting in
7 late, shortened, interrupted, or missed meal periods. These requirements also meant Plaintiffs
8 and the Class were not relieved of all duty during their meal periods. Additionally, Plaintiffs and
9 the Class were required to respond to work calls and communications while on their purported
10 meal periods resulting in short or interrupted meal periods. Further, Plaintiffs and the Class were
11 required to wear their company radios at all times, including during meal periods, and were
12 required to respond to work requests from supervisors while clocked out during purported meal
13 periods. Moreover, despite failing to provide compliant meal periods, Defendants maintained a
14 practice of recording Plaintiffs and the Class' scheduled meal period times rather than actual
15 meal period start and end times, in order to reflect the recordation of a compliant meal period.
16 As a result, Plaintiffs and the Class were not provided with uninterrupted and complete meal
17 periods. Despite this, Plaintiffs and the Class were not paid the appropriate meal period
18 premiums. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to
19 Plaintiffs and the Class in compliance with California law.

20 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
21 and permit Plaintiffs and the Class to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendants often
22 required Plaintiffs and the Class to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without
23 Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a net 10-minute, continuous and
24 uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction thereof), or without
25 compensating Plaintiffs and the Class for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted.
26 Defendants also did not adequately inform Plaintiffs and the Class of their right to take a rest
27 period. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or
28 authorizing rest periods for Plaintiffs and the Class, nor did Defendants have adequate policies

1 or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendants also did not have adequate policies
2 or practices to verify whether Plaintiffs and the Class were taking their required rest periods.
3 Further, Defendants did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore
4 Defendants cannot demonstrate that Plaintiffs and the Class took rest periods during the middle
5 of each work period. For example, Plaintiffs and the Class were required to prioritize work tasks
6 over taking rest periods and were often required to forgo their rest periods. Additionally, Plaintiffs
7 and the Class were required to wear their company radios at all times, including during rest
8 periods, and were required to respond to work requests from supervisors while on their
9 purported rest periods. As a result, Plaintiffs and the Class were rarely provided with compliant
10 rest periods and were regularly required to work through their rest periods. Despite this,
11 Plaintiffs and the Class were not paid the appropriate rest period premiums. Accordingly,
12 Defendants' policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiffs and the Class to take
13 rest periods in compliance with California law.

14 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiffs and the
15 Class to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants
16 without reimbursement. For example, Plaintiffs and the Class were required to use their
17 personal cell phones for work purposes such as communicating with co-workers and supervisors
18 regarding work-related issues. Plaintiffs and the Class were also required to purchase tools but
19 were not reimbursed for these expenses. Plaintiffs and the Class were also required to use their
20 personal vehicles for work purposes, but were not reimbursed for these costs. Plaintiffs and the
21 Class were not adequately compensated for these work-related expenses.

22 20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
23 pay Plaintiffs and the Class at the conclusion of their employment all wages for all minimum
24 wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages. Further,
25 Defendants did not pay Plaintiffs and the Class their final paychecks immediately upon
26 termination.

27 21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiffs and the
28 Class with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross

1 and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned for hours worked,
2 correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in
3 accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and
4 permitted to take in accordance with California law, and Defendant's address). As a result of
5 these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiffs and the Class suffered injury
6 because, among other things:

- 7 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
8 minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest
9 period premium wages to which they were entitled, even though they were
10 entitled;
- 11 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum,
12 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even
13 though they had not been;
- 14 (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid
15 minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages
16 at the correct California rate even though they were;
- 17 (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime,
18 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct
19 California rate even though they had not been;
- 20 (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum,
21 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- 22 (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
23 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have
24 to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages
25 owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage
26 statements contained the required accurate information;

- 1 (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to
2 lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security,
3 disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;
4 (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages
5 rates to which Plaintiffs and the Class were entitled, and Plaintiffs and the
6 Class were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they were
7 entitled.

8 Thus, Plaintiffs and the Class are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code §
9 226(e), including actual damages.

10 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

11 22. Plaintiffs bring certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all
12 other persons similarly situated, and thus, seek class certification under California Code of Civil
13 Procedure § 382.

14 23. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiffs seek relief
15 authorized by California law.

16 24. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

17 All persons who worked for any Defendant in California as an hourly, non-
18 exempt employee, but whose employment was not covered by a collective
19 bargaining agreement, at any time during the period beginning four years before
20 the filing of the initial complaint in this action and ending when notice of class
certification to the Class is sent.

21 25. At all material times, Plaintiffs were members of the Class.

22 26. Plaintiffs undertake this concerted activity to improve the wages and working
23 conditions of all Class Members.

24 27. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is
25 readily ascertainable:

- 26 (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so
27 numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical.
28 The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiffs at this time,

1 however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals and the
2 identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of
3 Defendants' records.

4 (b) Typicality: Plaintiffs are qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately
5 protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared,
6 well-defined community of interest, and Plaintiffs' claims (or defenses, if
7 any) are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.

8 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiffs are qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately
9 protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared,
10 well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as
11 demonstrated herein. Plaintiffs have no conflicts with or interests
12 antagonistic to any Class Member. Plaintiffs' attorneys, the proposed class
13 counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery,
14 certification, and settlement. Plaintiffs have incurred, and throughout the
15 duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that
16 have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this
17 action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

18 (d) Superiority: A Class Action is superior to other available methods for the
19 fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration
20 of:

- 21 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually
- 22 controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions;
- 23 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy
- 24 already commenced by or against members of the Class;
- 25 3) The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of
- 26 the claims in the particular forum; and
- 27 4) The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a
- 28 class action.

(e) Public Policy Considerations: The public policy of the State of California is to resolve the California Labor Code claims of many employees through a class action. Indeed, current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are also fearful of bringing actions because they believe their former employers might damage their future endeavors through negative references and/or other means. Class actions provide the class members who are not named in the complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights at the same time as their privacy is protected.

28. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class (and each subclass, if any) that predominate over questions affecting only individual members, including without limitation, whether, as alleged herein, Defendants have:

- (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum wages, and overtime wages;
- (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class Members;
- (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages to Class Members;
- (d) Failed to promptly pay all wages due to Class Members upon their discharge or resignation;
- (e) Failed to maintain accurate records of all hours Class Members worked, and all meal periods Class Members took or missed;
- (f) Failed to reimburse Class Members for all necessary business expenses; and
- (g) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et. seq.* as a result of their illegal conduct as described above.

29. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to

1 California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because:

- 2 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any
3 question affecting only individual members;
- 4 (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
5 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- 6 (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all
7 members of the class before the Court;
- 8 (d) Plaintiffs, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain
9 effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a
10 class action;
- 11 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and
12 equitable relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate
13 compensation for the damages and injuries for which Defendants are
14 responsible in an amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members
15 of the Class for the injuries sustained;
- 16 (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by
17 individual members of the class would create a risk of:
- 18 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
19 members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards
20 of conduct for Defendants; and/or
- 21 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would,
22 as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other
23 members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially
24 impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including but
25 not limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from
26 those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,
- 27 (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
28 the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to

1 the class as a whole.

2 30. Plaintiffs contemplate the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of
3 the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own
4 business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the
5 contemplated notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiffs would
6 contemplate the use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as
7 published notice, e-mail notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by
8 other methods suitable to the Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

9 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Minimum Wages for All Hours Worked)**

11 31. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs
12 1 through 20 in this Complaint.

13 32. "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of
14 an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or
15 not required to do so.

16 33. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants knowingly failed to pay to
17 Plaintiffs and the Class compensation for all hours they worked. By their failure to pay
18 compensation for each hour worked as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the
19 provisions of Section 1194 of the California Labor Code, and any additional applicable Wage
20 Orders, which require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

21 34. Accordingly, Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to recover minimum wages for
22 all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

23 35. By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiffs and the Class have been
24 deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned by virtue of their employment with Defendants.

25 36. By virtue of the Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to
26 Plaintiffs and the Class for their non-overtime hours worked without pay, Plaintiffs and the
27 Class suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to
28

1 Plaintiffs and the Class, but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court, and which
2 will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

3 37. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code §
4 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage
5 compensation due Plaintiffs and the Class.

6 38. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiffs and the Class are
7 entitled to recover liquidated damages (double damages) for Defendants' failure to pay
8 minimum wages.

9 39. California Labor Code section 204 requires employers to provide employees with
10 all wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period
11 applicable to this cause of action, Plaintiffs and the Class were entitled to be paid twice a month
12 at rates required by law, including minimum wages. However, during all such times,
13 Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay Plaintiffs and the Class all such wages due,
14 and failed to pay those wages twice a month.

15 40. Plaintiffs and the Class are also entitled to seek recovery of all unpaid minimum
16 wages, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code §§
17 218.5, 218.6, and 1194(a).

18 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)**

20 41. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs
21 1 through 20 in this Complaint.

22 42. California Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be
23 employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless
24 they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

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

1 by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

2 44. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiffs and the Class have worked more than eight
3 hours in a workday, as employees of Defendants.

4 45. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the Class
5 overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the maximum hours
6 permissible by law as required by California Labor Code § 510 and 1198. Plaintiffs and the
7 Class are regularly required to work overtime hours.

8 46. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional premium rate
9 compensation to the Plaintiffs and the Class for their overtime hours worked, Plaintiffs and the
10 Class have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently
11 unknown to them but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court and which will be
12 ascertained according to proof at trial.

13 47. By failing to keep adequate time records required by Labor Code § 1174(d),
14 Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation due to
15 Plaintiffs and the Class.

16 48. Plaintiffs and the Class also request recovery of overtime compensation according
17 to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a), as well
18 as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the
19 California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

20 49. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all
21 wages due and payable twice a month. The Wage Orders also provide that every employer shall
22 pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime wages for all
23 overtime hours worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and the
24 Class with all compensation due, in violation of California Labor Code § 204.

25 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)**

27 50. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs
28 1 through 20 in this Complaint.

1 51. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the
2 Plaintiffs and the Class of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than the
3 start of Plaintiffs and the Class' sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal
4 periods no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Section 512 of the
5 California Labor Code, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an employer
6 provide unpaid meal periods of at least 30 minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a
7 violation of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code for an employer to require any
8 employee to work during any meal period mandated under any Wage Order.

9 52. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiffs
10 and the Class with both meal periods as required by California law. By their failure to permit
11 and authorize Plaintiffs and the Class to take all meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact
12 that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods),
13 Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code and
14 the applicable Wage Orders.

15 53. Under California law, Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of
16 additional wages at the regular rate of pay for each workday he or she was not provided with all
17 required meal period(s), plus interest thereon.

18 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods)**

20 54. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs
21 1 through 20 in this Complaint.

22 55. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of net 10
23 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction thereof (i.e. more than two
24 hours). Section 512 of the California Labor Code, the applicable Wage Orders require that the
25 employer permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of 10 minutes each for
26 each 4-hour period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten
27 minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so
28 required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of Section 226.7 of

1 the California Labor Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest
2 period mandated under any Wage Order.

3 56. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiffs and the
4 Class to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked more than 4 hours in a
5 workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiffs and the Class to take rest periods as
6 alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take
7 these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 226.7
8 of the California Labor Code and the applicable Wage Orders.

9 57. Under California law, Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of
10 additional wages at the regular rate of pay for each workday he or she was not provided with all
11 required rest break(s), plus interest thereon.

12 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses)**

14 58. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs
15 1 through 20 in this Complaint.

16 59. Defendants violated Labor Code section 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, by
17 failing to pay and indemnify the Plaintiffs and the Class for their necessary expenditures and
18 losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to
19 directions of Defendants.

20 60. As a result, Plaintiffs and the Class were damaged at least in the amounts of the
21 expenses they paid, or which were deducted by Defendants from their wages.

22 61. Plaintiffs and the class they represent are entitled to attorney's fees, expenses, and
23 costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(c) and interest pursuant to Labor Code section
24 2802(b).

25 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees – Waiting Time**
27 **Penalties)**

1 62. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs
2 1 through 20 in this Complaint.

3 63. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if
4 an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are
5 due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment,
6 his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter,
7 unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to
8 quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

9 64. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiffs and
10 many other members of the Class ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the
11 employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and
12 continue to fail to pay terminated Class Members, without abatement, all wages required to be
13 paid by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within
14 seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

15 65. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and those Class members who are no longer
16 employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within
17 seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor
18 Code §§ 201 and 202.

19 66. California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay
20 wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall
21 continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is
22 commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

23 67. Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally
24 accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days
25 maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

26 68. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, Plaintiffs and the
27 Class are also entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs
28 incurred in this action.

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and**
3 **Compliant Wage Records)**

4 69. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs
5 1 through 20 in this Complaint.

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

17 71. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with
18 complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the
19 failure to correctly identify the gross wages earned by Plaintiffs and the Class, the failure to list
20 the true “total hours worked by the employee,” and the failure to list the true net wages earned.

21 72. As a result of Defendants’ violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiffs
22 and the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

23 73. Specifically, Plaintiffs and the members of the Class have been injured by
24 Defendants’ intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied
25 both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage
26 statements under California Labor Code § 226(a).

27 74. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiffs and the Class is difficult and
28 time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiffs and the Class were also injured

1 as a result of having to bring this action to attempt to obtain correct wage information following
2 Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the mandates of California's Labor Code and
3 related laws and regulations.

4 75. Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their actual
5 damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a).

6 76. Plaintiffs and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief, as well as an award of
7 attorney's fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor
8 Code § 226(h).

9 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **(Against all Defendants for Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200,**
11 **et seq.)**

12 77. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs
13 1 through 20 in this Complaint.

14 78. Defendants, and each of them, are "persons" as defined under California Business
15 & Professions Code § 17201.

16 79. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
17 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiffs, other Class members, and to the general public. Plaintiffs
18 seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil
19 Procedure § 1021.5.

20 80. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and
21 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions
22 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

23 81. A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be
24 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as
25 violations of, among other things, the California Labor Code, are unlawful and in violation of
26 public policy; and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive, fraudulent and unscrupulous,
27 and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in violation of
28 California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

1 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

2 82. Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages, and other benefits in violation of the
3 California Labor Code constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California
4 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

5 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

6 83. Defendants' failure to pay overtime compensation and other benefits in violation
7 of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity
8 prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

9 **Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of All Hours Worked**

10 84. Defendants' failure to maintain accurate records of all hours worked in accordance
11 with California Labor Code § 1174.5 and the IWC Wage Orders constitutes unlawful and/or
12 unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

13 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

14 85. Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor
15 Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful
16 and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

17 **Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods**

18 86. Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with
19 California Labor Code § 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes
20 unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

21 **Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses**

22 87. Defendants' failure to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses in
23 accordance with California Labor Code § 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above,
24 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§
25 17200, *et seq.*

26 **Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

27 88. Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements in accordance
28 with California Labor Code § 226, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity

1 prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

2 89. By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices
3 described herein, the Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from
4 Plaintiffs, and all persons similarly situated, and have deprived Plaintiffs, and all persons
5 similarly situated, of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

6 90. Plaintiffs and the Class Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result of
7 Defendants' wrongful conduct.

8 91. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, are
9 entitled to, and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property
10 which the Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiffs and the Class have been
11 deprived, by means of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.
12 Plaintiffs and the Class are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful
13 practices of Defendants in order to recover restitution.

14 92. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, are further
15 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair,
16 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of them,
17 from engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
18 practices in the future.

19 93. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, have no
20 plain, speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members
21 suffered as a consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
22 practices. As a result of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described
23 above, Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, have suffered
24 and will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are
25 restrained from continuing to engage in said unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
26 practices.

27 94. Plaintiffs also allege that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth
28 herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other

1 withholdings.

2 95. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiffs
3 and putative Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by
4 Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a
5 permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiffs and
6 Class Members; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §
7 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

8 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

9 Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated only with respect to
10 the class claims, pray for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as
11 follows:

12 **Class Certification**

- 13 1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second,
14 Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action;
15 2. That Plaintiffs be appointed as the representatives of the Class; and
16 3. That counsel for Plaintiffs be appointed as Class Counsel.

17 **As to the First Cause of Action**

- 18 4. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
19 Labor Code §§ 204 and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all
20 minimum wages due;
21 5. For general unpaid wages as may be appropriate;
22 6. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
23 such amounts were due;
24 7. For liquidated damages;
25 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
26 California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,
27 9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

28 **As to the Second Cause of Action**

- 1 10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
2 Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all
3 overtime wages due;
- 4 11. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;
- 5 12. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing
6 from the date such amounts were due;
- 7 13. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
8 California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,
- 9 14. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

10 As to the Third Cause of Action

- 11 15. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
12 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;
- 13 16. For unpaid meal period premium wages as may be appropriate;
- 14 17. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
15 such amounts were due;
- 16 18. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5,
17 and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
- 18 19. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

19 As to the Fourth Cause of Action

- 20 20. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
21 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;
- 22 21. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate;
- 23 22. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
24 such amounts were due;
- 25 23. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5,
26 and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
- 27 24. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

28 As to the Fifth Cause of Action

1 25. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §
2 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders;

3 26. For general unpaid wages and reimbursement of business expenses as may be
4 appropriate;

5 27. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
6 such amounts were due;

7 28. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

8 29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

9 As to the Sixth Cause of Action

10 30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
11 Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time
12 of termination of the employment;

13 31. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 for former
14 employees who have left Defendants' employ;

15 32. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were
16 due;

17 33. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

18 34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

19 As to the Seventh Cause of Action

20 35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record
21 keeping provisions of California Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and
22 willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

23 36. For penalties and actual damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);

24 37. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California
25 Labor Code § 226(h);

26 38. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

27 39. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

28 As to the Eighth Cause of Action

1 40. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
2 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay wages for all hours worked
3 (including minimum and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain
4 accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, and failing to
5 maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods, failing to furnish accurate wage
6 statements, and failing to indemnify necessary business expenses;

7 41. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiffs and all Class Members and
8 prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

9 42. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all
10 funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by
11 Defendants as a result of violations of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*;

12 43. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
13 California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5;

14 44. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California
15 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and,

16 45. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

17 As to all Causes of Action

18 46. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.

19
20 Dated: May 5, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

21 THE SENTINEL FIRM, APC

22
23 By: 
24 Seung L. Yang
25 Tiffany Hyun
26 Andrew Weaver
27 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
28

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury.

Dated: May 5, 2026

THE SENTINEL FIRM, APC

By: 
Seung L. Yang
Tiffany Hyun
Andrew Weaver
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 *Case No.: 25CV129909*

3 *Stewart v. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory*

4 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ALAMEDA**

5 I am employed in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. I am over the age of 18 and not a
6 party to the within suit. The name and address of my residence or business is The Sentinel Firm,
APC, 707 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 4700, Los Angeles, CA 90017. On the date indicated below, I served
the document described as:

7 **FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

8
9
10 by placing ☐ (the original) ☒ (a true copy thereof) on the person(s) listed below as follows:

11 **SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP**

12 *Attorneys for Defendant Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC*

13 Brooke S. Purcell (bpurcell@sheppardmullin.com)

14 Rachel J. Moroski (rmoroski@sheppardmullin.com)

15 Shayla M. Griffin (smgriffin@sheppardmullin.com)

16 Alexis S. Cherry (acherry@sheppardmullin.com)

17 Four Embarcadero Center, 17th Floor

18 San Francisco, California 94111-4109

19 ☒ **BY EMAIL:** I hereby certify that this document was served from Los Angeles, California, by e-
20 mail delivery on the parties listed herein at their most recent known e-mail address from e-
21 mail janeth.aguirre@thesentinel firm com pursuant to California Rules of Court. I did not
22 receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other
23 indication that the transmission was unsuccessful

24 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true
25 and correct.

26 Executed on May 5, 2026, at Los Angeles, California.

27
28 Janeth Aguirre

Name


Signature