

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

Bryce Bommer (SBN 313846)

bbommer@tomorrowlaw.com

1460 Westwood Boulevard

Los Angeles, California 90024

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

Attorneys for Plaintiff EARL SMITH,
as an Aggrieved Employee, and on behalf of all other
Aggrieved Employees

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

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

Plaintiff

v.

G. I. TRUCKING COMPANY, a California
Corporation doing business as ESTES WEST;
and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: **CVRI2601021**

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 Earl Smith ("Plaintiff"), as an Aggrieved Employee, and on behalf of all other
2 Aggrieved Employees under the Labor Code Private Attorneys' General Act of 2004, alleges as
3 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 G. I. Trucking
7 Company, a California corporation doing business as Estes West, and any of its respective
8 subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("G. I. Trucking") (hereinafter, G.
9 I. Trucking, collectively, with DOES 1 through 100, as further defined below, "Defendants") as a
10 proxy of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the State of California ("LWDA"), on
11 behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees that worked for Defendants during the PAGA
12 Period. Specifically, in connection with any alleged claims for failure to comply with Labor Code
13 sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 221, 223, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 233, 234, 245, 246, 432,
14 510, 512, 551, 552, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1198, 1198.5, 1197, 1197.1, 2800,
15 2802, 2699, as well as applicable Wage Orders, Plaintiff seeks to represent all current and former
16 employees that worked for Defendants during the PAGA Period. On all other claims mentioned
17 herein, Plaintiff seeks to represent only non-exempt current and former employees that worked for
18 Defendants during the PAGA Period. Collectively, these employees are herein referred to as
19 "Aggrieved Employees." The "PAGA Period" refers to three years preceding the date notice was
20 submitted to the LWDA, continuing past the date of notice to the LWDA into perpetuity.

21 **PARTIES**

22 2. Plaintiff EARL SMITH is a resident of the State of California. At all relevant times
23 herein, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants employed
24 Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee with duties that included, but were not limited to, truck driving,
25 driving to terminals, dropping off trailers, and hooking up to other terminals trailers before returning.
26 Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Plaintiff EARL SMITH worked
27 for Defendants from approximately December of 2024 through approximately March of 2025.

28 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant G. I.

1 Trucking is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and by
2 virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of Riverside, State of
3 California. At all relevant times herein, G. I. Trucking employed Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees
4 within the State of California

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

12 **JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS**

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

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

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

1 aforesaid acts and conduct of said corporate employees, agents, and representatives, the defendant
2 corporation respectively and collectively ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded,
3 acquiesced, authorized, and otherwise approved of each and all of the said acts and conduct of the
4 aforementioned corporate employees, agents and representatives.

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

7 **JURISDICTION**

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

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

19 **PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ALLEGATIONS**

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

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

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

5 14. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, on or around August 15, 2025, Plaintiff
6 provided written notice of Defendants' violation of various provisions of the Labor Code to the
7 LWDA online and by certified mail, with return receipt requested, to Defendants ("PAGA Notice").

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

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

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

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

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

20. In the event, the LWDA and/or a court issued a finding or determination to the Defendants, or either of them, that within five (5) years preceding the date of the PAGA Notice the policies or practices which gave rise to the violations alleged herein were unlawful, Defendants, or any of them, would be subject to heightened penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(f)(2)(B)(i), 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3) and **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h) for remedying violations either prior to or after the serving of the PAGA Notice. Regardless, Plaintiff alleges Defendants' conduct giving rise to the violations as detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, particularly given, among other reasons, Defendants have been sued for these violations in the past. Thus, Defendants, or any of them, are further subject to increased penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii) and lack eligibility for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

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

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

23. Upon information and belief, Defendants failed to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked by Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees at the proper rates of pay. Defendants also engaged, suffered, or permitted Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to suffer under Defendant's control due to, without limitation: to make or receive phone calls off the clock.

24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 223, 510, 551, 552, 1197, 1182.12, and applicable

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

9 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants, and
10 each of them, had and have a policy or practice of compelling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
11 Employees during the PAGA Period to work every day in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per
12 day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or
13 compensation in lieu thereof. By way of example, Defendants regularly denied Plaintiff and
14 Aggrieved Employees lawful meal periods by, without limitation, by interrupting meal periods; not
15 providing timely meal periods; and requiring that employees carry cellular telephones during meal
16 periods. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations.
17 Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated
18 Labor Code sections 512 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period,
19 and thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay
20 for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Plaintiff
21 is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not
22 made for these non-compliant meal periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay.
23 Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure
24 to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant
25 meal periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive
26 relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based
27 thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct that gave rise to such violations and was malicious,
28

1 fraudulent, or oppressive. As such, Defendants are further liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor
2 Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

3 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
4 maintain policies or practices of compelling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees every day to,
5 including, without limitation, work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without
6 authorizing and permitting Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted, timely,
7 and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the employees are completely relieved of all of their
8 duties. By way of example, Defendants regularly denied Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees lawful
9 rest periods by, without limitation, by failing to provide rest periods all together; failing to provide
10 a suitable rest facility; failing to provide rest periods that were at least ten minutes in length;
11 interrupting them; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones during rest periods; and not
12 providing rest periods in a timely fashion. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees personally
13 suffered these violations. Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon
14 alleges, that Defendants violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved
15 Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour
16 of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under
17 Labor Code section 226.7. However, Plaintiff is informed and believes that those premium
18 payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant rest
19 periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7
20 and 1198. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210
21 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking
22 of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7,
23 or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further informed and believes,
24 and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was
25 malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such, Defendants are further liable for civil penalties
26 pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

27 27. As a result of, among other things, Defendants' herein-described policy or practice
28 of failing to: accurately record time; failing to pay overtime and minimum wages; failing to provide

1 meal periods; failing to provide rest periods; and failing to provide compensation in lieu of meal or
2 rest periods, as described above, and due to independent failures in connection therewith, Plaintiff
3 is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants also intentionally failed and
4 continues to fail to furnish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements that
5 accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; the
6 inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; the name of the employee and only the
7 last four digits of their social security number or an employee identification number other than a
8 social security number; all deductions; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
9 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee; the legal name and
10 address of the employer, and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226,
11 subdivision (a). Specifically, Defendants intentionally failed to furnish employees with itemized
12 wage statements that accurately reflect the hours worked by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
13 Employees and the rates of pay at which they were or should have been paid (including due to failure
14 to pay at the proper regular rate), thus resulting in a failure to reflect gross and net wages earned and
15 paid at each rate, as well. Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon
16 alleges, that Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226, and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved
17 Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Plaintiff and each Aggrieved Employee
18 personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 226 for each
19 pay period worked during the PAGA Period. Plaintiff is informed and believes that those penalties
20 under Labor Code section 226 were not paid for these violations of Labor Code section 226.
21 Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558,
22 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further
23 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such
24 violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Thus, Defendants would further be liable
25 for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

26 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants also
27 willfully or intentionally failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to timely pay
28 compensation to Plaintiff and other terminated or resigned employees, including but not limited to,

1 failing to pay all overtime wages owed, all minimum wages; all premium pay owed; and all paid
2 sick leave, vacation pay and paid time off, as set forth above, among other things. Consequently,
3 Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated Labor Code
4 sections 201, 202 203, and 1198 each pay period for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA
5 Period, and thus Plaintiff and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and
6 was owed penalties under Labor Code section 203 for each pay period worked during the PAGA
7 Period. However, Plaintiff is informed and believes that those penalties under Labor Code section
8 203 were not made for these violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203. Defendants would
9 thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive
10 relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(j). Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based
11 thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious,
12 fraudulent, or oppressive. As such, Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant
13 to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

14 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants also
15 failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without
16 limitation, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for the purchase and
17 maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans, in direct consequence of the discharge of
18 their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of Defendants, as required by Labor Code sections
19 1198, 2800, 2802, and other statutory and common law offenses. As a result, Plaintiff and other
20 Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Defendants are liable to
21 reimburse Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for these costs incurred in furtherance of work
22 duties. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558,
23 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further
24 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such
25 violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such, Defendants would further be liable
26 for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

27 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had
28 and have a policy or practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees their paid

1 time off and vacation time owed upon separation of employment as wages at their final rate of pay
2 in violation of Labor Code section 227.3 and applicable Wage Orders. As such, Plaintiff and other
3 Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Defendants would be liable for
4 civil penalties for violation of Labor Code section 227.3 under Labor Code section 558, 1198 and
5 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further informed and
6 believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and
7 was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Therefore, Defendants would further be liable for civil
8 penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

9 31. 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 32. 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 33. [Where Applicable and the Portions Applicable Based on What Was Received] In
18 addition to the above, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants
19 failed and continue to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and
20 similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold
21 employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5,
22 time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
23 Employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Defendants also failed to
24 provide these documents to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees upon request, April 23, 2025,
25 in violation of these Labor Code sections. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees personally
26 suffered these violations, which in turn would entitle Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to
27 penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Defendants would also be liable for
28 civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5, and 2699. Plaintiff further informed

1 and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations
2 and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties
3 pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

4 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
5 maintain policies or practices of failing to, for piece-rate employees, failing to pay the minimum
6 amounts required under Labor Code section 226.2 for non-productive time in violation of the above-
7 referenced minimum wage law. Finally, for these employees, Defendants violated Labor Code
8 section 226.2 by failing to provide the information on wage statements required by Labor Code
9 section 226.2 to the extent it does not include for piece-rate work the information required therein
10 including, without limitation, the quantity, rate and units worked per piece, as well as separately
11 itemized non-productive time and rest and recovery periods. In addition, Defendants failed to
12 provide employees with rest and recovery periods as required under Labor Code section 226.2.

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; and

1 other such information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

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

7 Violation of Labor Code § 558

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

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

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

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

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

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

28 Violation of Labor Code § 1174.5

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

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

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

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

25 51. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants have
26 willfully failed to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar
27 payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment
28 under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records

1 under Labor Code section 1174.

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

6 Violation of Labor Code § 1197.1

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

- 13 (1) For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars
14 (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
15 employee is underpaid. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
16 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
17 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.
- 18 (2) For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty
19 dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
20 employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is
21 intentionally committed. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
22 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
23 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.
- 24 (3) Wages, liquidated damages, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
25 Section 203, recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected
26 employee."

27 54. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants caused
28 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees not to be paid minimum wages as a result of Defendants

1 routinely failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked by Plaintiff and
2 Aggrieved Employees at the proper rates of pay, as described above.

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

9 Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 2699

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

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

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

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

25 **PRAYER**

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

28 A. An award of civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558,

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

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

8
9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28