

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Courtney M. Miller, Esq. (SBN 327850)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Emails: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
cmiller@lelawfirm.com
WHT1@lelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff WILLIAM C. LAWSON,
on behalf of himself and current and former aggrieved employees

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

WILLIAM C. LAWSON, on behalf of himself
and current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

DECKER OUTDOOR CORPORATION; REAL
TIME STAFFING SERVICES, LLC dba
SELECT STAFFING; and DOES 1 to 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **CVRI 2302056**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF WILLIAM C.
LAWSON'S COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff WILLIAM C. LAWSON ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and
complains against Defendants DECKER OUTDOOR CORPORATION; REAL TIME
STAFFING SERVICES, LLC dba SELECT STAFFING; 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-

1 exempt employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated
2 with Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all
3 hours worked at the employees' minimum wage rate or overtime rate, failure to provide all legally
4 required and legally compliant meal and rest periods, failure to timely pay earned wages during
5 employment, failure to issue payment of wages due in legally permissible manner; failure to
6 provide complete and accurate wage statements, failure to timely pay all unpaid wages following
7 separation of employment. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor
8 and Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor
9 Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and
10 others aggrieved.

11 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

12 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
13 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
14 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
15 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars
16 (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
17 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
18 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
19 California, including but not limited to Riverside County at 17791 N. Perris Blvd, Moreno Valley,
20 CA 92551.

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

25 **III. PARTIES**

26 4. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
27 Development Agency on behalf of himself and other current and former employees subject to
28 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is

1 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will
2 work for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
3 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the
4 currently named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was
5 employed by Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Riverside from in or
6 February 2, 2022, until on or about February 23, 2022.

7 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant DECKER
8 OUTDOOR CORPORATION is authorized to do business within the State of California and is
9 doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-25 are, and at all times
10 relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant DECKER OUTDOOR
11 CORPORATION in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and
12 hour practices or policies. Defendant DECKER OUTDOOR CORPORATION operates in
13 Riverside County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Riverside County, including
14 but not limited to, at 17791 N. Perris Blvd, Moreno Valley, CA 92551.

15 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant REAL TIME
16 STAFFING SERVICES, LLC dba SELECT STAFFING is authorized to do business within the
17 State of California and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES
18 26-50 are, and at all times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant REAL
19 TIME STAFFING SERVICES, LLC dba SELECT STAFFING CORPORATION in the
20 establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies.
21 Defendant REAL TIME STAFFING SERVICES, LLC dba SELECT STAFFING operates in
22 Riverside County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Riverside County, including
23 but not limited to, at 17791 N. Perris Blvd, Moreno Valley, CA 92551.

24 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 1
25 through 50 are corporations, or are other business entities or organizations of a nature unknown to
26 Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California non-exempt employees, permitted
27 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised control over the wages, hours and
28 working conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

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

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

10. 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)

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

12. 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, 212, 213 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197; and the applicable Wage Orders.

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

14. **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,”

1 which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the
2 employee is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either
3 directly or indirectly, performing services which inure to the benefit of the employer.

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

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

13 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
14 non-exempt employees to line up to wait to undergo and undergo off-the-clock 1-2 minute bag
15 checks prior to being permitted to clock-in for their start shifts and line up to wait to undergo and
16 undergo off-the-clock 1-2 minute bag checks after clocking out for the end of their shifts.

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

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

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

4 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40)
5 hours in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of
6 work in any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-
7 one-half (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve
8 (12) hours in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular
9 rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any
10 seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the
11 regular rate of pay of an employee.

12 Labor Code section 510.

13 20. In this case, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former
14 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees overtime wages for all overtime hours
15 worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to:

16 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
17 non-exempt employees to line up to wait to undergo and undergo off-the-clock 1-2 minute bag
18 checks prior to being permitted to clock-in for their start shifts and line up to wait to undergo and
19 undergo off-the-clock 1-2 minute bag checks after clocking out for the end of their shifts.

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

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

23. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512; Wage Order 9 at §11; *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. A paid "on duty" meal period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

24. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code section 226.7; Wage Order 9 at §11.

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

(a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees timely, uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes for every five hours worked; and/or

(b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees duty-free meal breaks due to Defendants requirement that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees remain on Employers' premises during meal breaks. Employers' continued exercise of control over how Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees spent their meal breaks rendered them on-duty subject to the control of Employers.

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

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

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

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

26 30. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer
27 must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday
28 the employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7;

1 Wage Order 9 at § 12.

2 31. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit all legally required and
3 compliant rest periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
4 non-exempt employees due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not
5 limited to:

6 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
7 hourly non-exempt employees timely, uninterrupted, duty-free rest breaks of at least a net 10
8 minutes; and

9 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
10 hourly non-exempt employees a third rest break when working shifts over 10 hours.

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

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

20 34. **Failure to Issue Payment of wages due in Legally Permissible Manner:**
21 Defendant failed to issue payment of wages due in legally permissible manner. California law
22 forbids an employer, or agent thereof, from issuing payment of wages due, or to become due, or as
23 an advance on wages to be earned in the form of any order, check, draft, note, memorandum, or
24 other acknowledgement of indebtedness, unless it is negotiable and payable in cash, on demand,
25 without discount, at some established place of business in the state, the name and address of which
26 must appear on the instrument, and at the time of its issuance and for a reasonable time thereafter,
27 which must be at least 30 days, the maker or drawer has sufficient funds in, or credit, arrangement,
28 or understanding with the drawee for its payment. Labor Code §212.

1 35. In this case, Defendants failed to issue payment of wages due to him and other
2 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees due to Defendants
3 policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to, issuing wages due and
4 requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
5 employees to accept payment in the form of a prepaid debit card, which requires a fee to use.
6 Furthermore, said fee was not considered in Employers' calculation of total overtime wages paid
7 nor did Employers reimburse Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
8 hourly non-exempt employees for fees they paid to use the prepaid debit card.

9 36. Defendant foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Defendant
10 failing to issue payment of wages to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
11 based hourly non-exempt employees in a legally permissible manner, in violation of Labor Code
12 section 212

13 37. **Failure to timely pay earned wages during employment:** In California, wages
14 must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the
15 employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code section 204(a). Wages
16 earned between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the
17 16th and the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day,
18 inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following
19 month. *Id.* Other payroll periods such as those that are weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly, must be
20 paid within seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period in which wages were
21 earned. Labor Code section 204(d).

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

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

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

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

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

43. Defendants' violations of Wage Order 9 constituted violations of Labor Code section 1198, which prohibits employment under conditions of labor that violate the Wage Orders.

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

45. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code section 2699.3. On February 15, 2023, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the violations alleged.

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

47. 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, 204 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197 beginning one (1) year 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, 204, 226.7, 512, 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, 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].

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

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

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

11 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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

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

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

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

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

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 Dated: April 24, 2023

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

2
3 By: 

4 Joseph Lavi, Esq.
5 Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
6 Courtney M. Miller, Esq.
7 Attorneys for Plaintiff
8 WILLIAM C. LAWSON,
9 on behalf of himself and current and former
10 aggrieved employees
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28