

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Melissa A. Huether, Esq. (SBN 316604)
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
mhuether@lelawfirm.com
WHT3@lelawfirm.com

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
4/13/2023 10:13 AM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By G. Robinson, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff INGRID M. GARCIA PEREZ,
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES-CENTRAL DISTRICT**

INGRID M. GARCIA PEREZ, on behalf of
herself and current and former aggrieved
employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

FOUNDATION PROPERTY MANAGEMENT,
INC.; RETIREMENT HOUSING
FOUNDATION; AND HILL RHF HOUSING
PARTNERS, L.P.; and DOES 1 to 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **23STCV08171**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF INGRID M. GARCIA
PEREZ'S COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff INGRID M. GARCIA PEREZ ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and
complains against Defendants FOUNDATION PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, INC.;
RETIREMENT HOUSING FOUNDATION; AND HILL RHF HOUSING PARTNERS, L.P.; and
DOES 1 to 100, inclusive (collectively "Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*
("PAGA") representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California, herself

1 and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-
2 exempt employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated
3 with Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all
4 hours worked at the employees' minimum wage rate or overtime rate, failure to provide all legally
5 required and/or legally compliant meal and/or rest periods, failure to timely pay earned wages
6 during employment, failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements, failure to timely
7 pay all unpaid wages following separation of employment. Plaintiff seeks on a representative
8 basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties,
9 reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf
10 of Plaintiff, the State of California, and 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 Los Angeles County at 255 South Hill Street, Los
20 Angeles, CA 90012.

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 herself 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 Los Angeles from in or
6 around October 2017, until on or about June 17, 2022.

7 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant
8 FOUNDATION PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, INC. is authorized to do business within the
9 State of California and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES
10 1-25 are, and at all times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant
11 FOUNDATION PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, INC. in the establishment of, or ratification of,
12 the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant FOUNDATION
13 PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, INC. operates in Los Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and
14 aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County, including but not limited to, at 255 South Hill
15 Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

16 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant
17 RETIREMENT HOUSING FOUNDATION is authorized to do business within the State of
18 California and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 25-50 are,
19 and at all times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant RETIREMENT
20 HOUSING FOUNDATION in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal
21 wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant RETIREMENT HOUSING FOUNDATION
22 operates in Los Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Los Angeles
23 County, including but not limited to, at 255 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

24 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant HILL RHF
25 HOUSING PARTNERS, L.P. is authorized to do business within the State of California and is
26 doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 51-75 are, and at all times
27 relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant HILL RHF HOUSING PARTNERS,
28 L.P. in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices

1 or policies. Defendant HILL RHF HOUSING PARTNERS, L.P. operates in Los Angeles County
2 and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County, including but not limited
3 to, at 255 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

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

9 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 76
10 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each of the individual defendants is sued
11 individually and in his or her capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner, representative, manager,
12 supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant who violated or caused to
13 be violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor Code and/or any provision of
14 the Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

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

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

24 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **CIVIL PENALTIES AND WAGES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS**

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

27 **(Against all Defendants by Plaintiff)**

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

1 13. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding Plaintiff sending the initial
2 PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201,
3 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, and Sections 14 and 15 of the applicable Wage
4 Orders.

5 14. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California
6 Labor Code:

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

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

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

22 (a) “Rounding down” or “shaving down” Plaintiff and other current and former
23 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees punches to the nearest quarter of an
24 hour to the benefit of Defendants without paying Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
25 California-based hourly non-exempt employees for this time.

26 18. Therefore, Defendants suffered, permitted, and required Plaintiff and other current
27 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to be subject to Defendants’
28 control without paying wages for that time. This resulted in Plaintiff and other current and former

1 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees working time for which they were not
2 compensated any wages, in violation of Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 and the applicable
3 Wage Order.

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

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

13 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40)
14 hours in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of
15 work in any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-
16 one-half (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve
17 (12) hours in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular
18 rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any
19 seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the
20 regular rate of pay of an employee.

21 Labor Code section 510.

22 21. In this case, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former
23 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees overtime wages for all overtime hours
24 worked due to Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to:

25 (a) “Rounding down” or “shaving down” Plaintiff and other current and former
26 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees punches to the nearest quarter of an
27 hour to the benefit of Defendants without paying Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
28 California-based hourly non-exempt employees for this time.

29 22. The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each
30 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
31 employees were under the control of Defendants but were not compensated. To the extent that the

1 foregoing uncompensated time occurred when Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
2 California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday,
3 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendants failed
4 to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code
5 sections 510 and 1194 and the applicable Wage Order.

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

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

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

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

1 (a) “Rounding down” or “shaving down” Plaintiff and other current and former
2 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees punches to the nearest quarter of an
3 hour to the benefit of Defendants without paying Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
4 California-based hourly non-exempt employees for this time.

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

11 28. Defendants’ foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff
12 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not
13 receiving wages to compensate them for workdays during which Defendants did not provide them
14 with meal periods in compliance with California law.

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

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

1 relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

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

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

10 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
11 non-exempt employees to remain on Defendant's premises and, therefore, exercising control over
12 how Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
13 employees spent their rest periods resulting in rest periods that were not duty-free as required.

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

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

23 35. **Failure to timely pay earned wages during employment:** In California, wages
24 must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the
25 employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code section 204(a). Wages
26 earned between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the
27 16th and the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day,
28 inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following

1 month. *Id.* Other payroll periods such as those that are weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly, must be
2 paid within seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period in which wages were
3 earned. Labor Code section 204(d).

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

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

24 38. As a derivative of Plaintiff's allegations above, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff
25 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
26 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest
27 period premium wages) rendered Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-
28 based hourly non-exempt employees' wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code

1 section 226.

2 39. **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 40. 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
8 all their earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages,
9 and/or rest period premium wages), Defendants failed to pay those employees timely after each
10 employee's termination and/or resignation, in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

11 41. Defendants' violations of Wage Order 4 constituted violations of Labor Code
12 section 1198, which prohibits employment under conditions of labor that violate the Wage Orders.

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

17 43. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor
18 Code section 2699.3. On February 6, 2023, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA
19 and provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific
20 provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to
21 support the violations alleged.

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

27 45. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
28 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204 226, 226.7, 510,

512, 1194, and 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].

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

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

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

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

2. For any and all legally applicable penalties during the relevant statute of limitations subject to any permissible tolling, including but not limited to those recoverable under the

1 California Labor Code, including but not limited to section 2699(f);

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

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

6

7 Dated: April 13, 2023

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

8

9

By:



10

Joseph Lavi, Esq.

Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.

Melissa A. Huether, Esq.

11

Attorneys for Plaintiff

12

INGRID M. GARCIA PEREZ,

on behalf of herself and current and former
aggrieved employees

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28