

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
WHT1@lelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff ROBIN HARRIS,
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees

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

ROBIN HARRIS, on behalf of herself and other
aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SUNRUN INSTALLATION SERVICES, INC.;
and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.:

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF ROBIN HARRIS'
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff ROBIN HARRIS ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains
against Defendants SUNRUN INSTALLATION SERVICES, INC.; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive
(collectively "Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*
("PAGA") representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California, herself
and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-
exempt employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated
with Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all
hours worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure

1 to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant meal periods or pay meal period
2 premium wages; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or
3 pay rest period premium wages; statutory penalties for failure to timely pay earned wages during
4 employment; statutory penalties for failure to provide accurate wage statements; statutory waiting
5 time penalties in the form of continuation wages for failure to timely pay employees all wages due
6 upon separation of employment. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the
7 Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to
8 Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California,
9 and others aggrieved.

10 2. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Judicial Council of California enacted
11 Emergency Rule 9 to the California Rules of Court, which provided that, notwithstanding any
12 other law, the statutes of limitations and repose for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are
13 tolled from April 6, 2020, until October 1, 2020.

14 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15 3. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
16 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
17 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
18 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars
19 (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
20 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
21 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
22 California, including but not limited to Sacramento County.

23 **III. PARTIES**

24 4. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
25 Development Agency on behalf of herself and other current and former employees subject to
26 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
27 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will
28 work for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp

1 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the
2 currently named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was
3 employed by Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Sacramento from in or
4 around June 2021, until on or about August 1, 2022.

5 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant SUNRUN
6 INSTALLATION SERVICES, INC. is authorized to do business within the State of California
7 and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all
8 times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant SUNRUN INSTALLATION
9 SERVICES, INC. in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and
10 hour practices or policies. Defendant SUNRUN INSTALLATION SERVICES, INC. operates in
11 Sacramento County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in in Sacramento County.

12 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 1
13 through 50 are corporations, or are other business entities or organizations of a nature unknown to
14 Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California non-exempt employees, permitted
15 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised control over the wages, hours and
16 working conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

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

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

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

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

CIVIL PENALTIES AND WAGES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS

GENERAL ACT OF 2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.

(Against all Defendants by Plaintiff)

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

11. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 2802 and Sections 14 and 15 of the applicable Wage Orders.

12. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California Labor Code:

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

14. Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 require an employer to compensate employees for all “hours worked” at least at a minimum wage rate of pay as established by the IWC and the Wage Orders.

15. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more minutes per shift than Defendants credited them with having worked. Specifically, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages at the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but

1 not limited to:

2 (a) “Rounding down” or “shaving down” Plaintiff and other current and former
3 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees punches to the nearest quarter of an
4 hour to the benefit of Defendants; and

5 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
6 non-exempt employees participate in off-the-clock trainings.

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

13 17. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay:**
14 Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt
15 employees. In California, an employer is required to pay hourly employees for all “hours worked,”
16 which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the
17 employee is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either
18 directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to the benefit of the employer.’

19 18. Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 require an employer to compensate employees a
20 higher rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, in excess of forty
21 (40) hours in a workweek, and on any seventh consecutive day of work in a workweek:

22 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40)
23 hours in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of
24 work in any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-
25 one-half (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve
26 (12) hours in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular
27 rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any
28 seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the
regular rate of pay of an employee.

27 Labor Code section 510.

28 19. In this case, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former

1 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees overtime wages for all overtime hours
2 worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to:

3 (a) "Rounding down" or "shaving down" Plaintiff and other current and former
4 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees punches to the nearest quarter of an
5 hour to the benefit of Defendants; and

6 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
7 non-exempt employees participate in off-the-clock trainings.

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

16 21. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
17 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant meal periods:** Plaintiff and other
18 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked
19 shifts of more than five (5) hours in length and shifts of more than ten (10) hours in length.

20 22. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an
21 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of
22 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the
23 employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512; Wage Order 4 at §11; *Brinker*
24 *Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ an
25 employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee
26 with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh
27 hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period
28 shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. A paid "on duty" meal

1 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being
2 relieved of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

3 23. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
4 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay
5 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
6 section 226.7; Wage Order 4 at §11.

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

11 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
12 hourly non-exempt employees 30-minute meal breaks due to Defendants' policy, practice, and/or
13 procedure of "rounding down" or "shaving down" Plaintiff's and similarly situated employees'
14 meal break punches to the nearest quarter.

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

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

25 27. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
26 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant rest periods:** Plaintiff and other
27 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked
28 shifts of more than three-and-a-half (3.5) hours.

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

12 29. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer
13 must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday
14 the employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7;
15 Wage Order 4 at § 12.

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

20 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
21 hourly non-exempt employees with timely, duty-free, net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every
22 four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof; and

23 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
24 hourly non-exempt employees with duty-free rest breaks due to Defendants’ requirement that they
25 remain on at the worksite during their rest periods

26 31. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
27 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
28 based hourly non-exempt employees with one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each

workday they did not receive legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor Code section 226.7.

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

33. **Failure to Indemnify for Losses and Expenditures Incurred as Part of Employment:** California law requires that every employer must indemnify its employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in discharge of his or her duties or at the obedience of the directions of the employer. Moreover, an employer is prohibited from passing the ordinary business expenses and losses of the employer onto the employee. (Lab. Code, § 2802.)

34. Defendants have violated Labor Code Section 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees' necessary expenditures they incurred in the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendants employed policies, practices, and/or procedures included, but were not limited to, requiring Plaintiff and similarly situated employees to use or purchase their own tools and/or resources in order to work for Defendants, including but not limited to their personal cell phones (including both telephone use and cellular data use) for work-related purposes - without reimbursing Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees for such use.

35. Moreover, Defendants employed policies and procedures which ensured Plaintiff and aggrieved employees would not receive indemnification for their employment related expenses. This practice resulted in Plaintiff and aggrieved employees not receiving such indemnification in compliance with California law.

36. Therefore, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for their employment related expenses, including but not limited to costs related to use of their personal cell phones and costs associated with their uniforms pursuant to Labor Code section 2802.

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

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

17 **39. Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section
18 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an
19 employee his or her wages, the employer must "furnish each of his or her employees ... an
20 itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the
21 employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is
22 exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of
23 the Industrial Welfare Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable
24 piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all
25 deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5)
26 net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the
27 name of the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal
28 entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and

1 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

2 40. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff
3 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
4 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest
5 period premium wages) rendered Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-
6 based hourly non-exempt employees’ wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code
7 section 226.

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

12 42. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, because Defendants failed to pay
13 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
14 all their earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages,
15 and/or rest period premium wages), Defendants failed to pay those employees timely after each
16 employee’s termination and/or resignation, in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

17 43. Defendants’ violations of Wage Order 4 constituted violations of Labor Code
18 section 1198, which prohibits employment under conditions of labor that violate the Wage Orders.

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

23 45. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor
24 Code section 2699.3. On January 5, 2023, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA
25 and provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific
26 provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to
27 support the violations alleged.

28 46. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by

1 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code
2 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the
3 parties notice within 60 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends
4 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

5 47. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
6 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510,
7 512, 1194, 1197, 2802 beginning one (1) year preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim
8 Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the following amounts:

9 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226.7, 512, 1198,
10 and 2802; one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial
11 violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each
12 subsequent violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

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

17 c. For violations of Labor Code section 510, fifty dollars (\$50) for each
18 employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, one
19 hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts
20 established by Labor Code section 558] and any unpaid wages.

21 d. For violations of Labor Code section 1194 and 1197, one hundred dollars
22 (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each
23 subsequent violation, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay
24 period [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 1197.1] and any unpaid wages.

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

27 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

28 **WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HERSELF AND ON OTHER**

1 **AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:**

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

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

5 2. For any and all legally applicable penalties during the relevant statute of limitations
6 subject to any permissible tolling, including but not limited to those recoverable under the
7 California Labor Code, including but not limited to section 2699(f);

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

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

12
13 Dated: March 14, 2023

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

14
15 By: *Vincent C. Granberry*
16 Joseph Lavi, Esq.
17 Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
18 Attorneys for Plaintiff
19 ROBIN HARRIS, current and former
20 aggrieved employees
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28