

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

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda
11/10/2025 at 02:41:39 PM
By: Andrel Gospel,
Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff TREIVON BROOKS,
on behalf of himself and current and former aggrieved employees

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

TREIVON BROOKS, on behalf of himself and
current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

U-HAUL CO. OF CALIFORNIA; U-HAUL
HOLDING COMPANY; and DOES 1 to 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **25CV153678**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF TREIVON BROOKS'
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff TREIVON BROOKS ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains
against Defendants U-HAUL CO. OF CALIFORNIA; U-HAUL HOLDING COMPANY; 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, himself
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; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or pay rest period premium wages; statutory penalties for failure to timely pay earned wages during employment; statutory penalties for failure to provide accurate wage statements; statutory waiting time penalties in the form of continuation wages for failure to timely pay employees all wages due upon separation of employment. Plaintiff experienced these violations personally, as well as is informed and believes other aggrieved employees did as well. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout California, including but not limited to Alameda County, at 6425 Stockton Blvd, Sacramento, CA 95823.

III. PARTIES

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

1 Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Alameda from in or around March 6,
2 2025, until on or about May 1, 2025.

3 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant U-HAUL CO.
4 OF CALIFORNIA is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business
5 in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-33 are, and at all times relevant hereto
6 were persons acting on behalf of Defendant U-HAUL CO. OF CALIFORNIA in the establishment
7 of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant U-
8 HAUL CO. OF CALIFORNIA operates in Alameda County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved
9 employees in Alameda County, including but not limited to, at 6425 Stockton Blvd, Sacramento,
10 CA 95823.

11 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant U-HAUL
12 HOLDING COMPANY is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing
13 business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 34-66 are, and at all times relevant
14 hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant U-HAUL HOLDING COMPANY in the
15 establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies.
16 Defendant U-HAUL HOLDING COMPANY operates in Alameda County and employed Plaintiff
17 and aggrieved employees in Alameda County, including but not limited to, at 6425 Stockton Blvd,
18 Sacramento, CA 95823.

19 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 1
20 through 66 are corporations, or are other business entities or organizations of a nature unknown to
21 Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California non-exempt employees, permitted
22 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised control over the wages, hours and working
23 conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

24 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 67
25 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each of the individual defendants is sued
26 individually and in his or her capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner, representative, manager,
27 supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant who violated or caused to be
28 violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor Code and/or any provision of the

1 Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

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

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

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**
13 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

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

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

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

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

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

28 12. Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 require an employer to compensate employees

1 for all “hours worked” at least at a minimum wage rate of pay as established by the IWC and the
2 Wage Orders.

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

9 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
10 hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours worked
11 or major fraction thereof.

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

18 15. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
19 Employer’s conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
20 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
21 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

26 17. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
27 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor Code
28 section 226.7; Wage Order 9 at §12. Under California law, “[e]mployees are entitled to 10 minutes’

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

9 18. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer must
10 pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday the
11 employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7; Wage
12 Order 9 at § 12.

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

17 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
18 hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours worked
19 or major fraction thereof.

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

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

1 22. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
2 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
3 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
4 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

21 25. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
22 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
23 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

24 26. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
25 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
26 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
27 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by
28 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful

1 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,
2 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor
3 Code section 1198, the Defendant secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while
4 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

5 27. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
6 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
7 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

21 29. As a derivative of Plaintiff's allegations above, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff
22 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
23 earned (including minimum wages, and rest period premium wages) rendered Plaintiff's and other
24 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' wage statements
25 inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

26 30. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

27 31. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
28 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section

1 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

2 32. **Failure to pay employees all wages due at time of termination/resignation:** An
3 employer is required to pay all unpaid wages timely after an employee's employment ends. The
4 wages are due immediately upon termination (Labor Code section 201) or within seventy-two (72)
5 hours of resignation (Labor Code section 202).

6 33. As a derivative of Plaintiff's allegations above, because Defendants failed to pay
7 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all
8 their earned wages (including minimum wages, and rest period premium wages), Defendants failed
9 to pay those employees timely after each employee's termination and/or resignation, in violation of
10 Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

11 34. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

12 35. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
13 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
14 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

19 37. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
20 section 2699.3. On August 12, 2025, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and
21 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of
22 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
23 violations alleged.

24 38. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by
25 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code
26 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the
27 parties notice within 60 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends
28 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

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

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

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

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

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

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND ON OTHER AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:

ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

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

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

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

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

10
11 Dated: November 10, 2025

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

12
13 By:



Joseph Lavi, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.
Harita Nandivada, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
TREIVON BROOKS, on behalf of himself and
current and former aggrieved employees