

1 ZACK I. DOMB, SBN 265185
 E-Mail zack@dombrauchwerger.com
 2 DEVIN RAUCHWERGER, SBN 274234
 E-Mail devin@dombrauchwerger.com
 3 ERIC Y. HAHN, SBN 311771
 E-Mail eric@dombrauchwerger.com
 4 **DOMB & RAUCHWERGER LLP**
 1055 East Colorado Blvd., Fifth Floor
 5 Pasadena, California 91106
 Telephone: (213) 537-9225

FILED
 Superior Court of California
 County of Los Angeles

12/12/2025

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: S. Drew Deputy

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 Bria McMillan

9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

10 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

11 Bria McMillan, individually and on behalf of
 others similarly situated,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 Best Health Services LLC dba Mid-Wilshire
 15 Health Center, a California company; and
 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

16 Defendants.

Case No.: 25STCV28760

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
 REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
 COMPLAINT**

- (1) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime)
- (2) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Unpaid Meal Period Premiums)
- (3) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226.7 (Unpaid Rest Period Premiums)
- (4) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 (Unpaid Minimum Wages)
- (5) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 204 and 210 (Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment)
- (6) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226(a) (Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements)
- (7) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses)
- (8) Violation of Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.
- (9) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 2699 (Private Attorneys General Act)

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

1 Plaintiff Bria McMillan (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of other members of the
2 general public similarly situated, and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the
3 Private Attorneys General Act, based upon facts that either have evidentiary support or are likely
4 to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation and discovery,
5 alleges as follows:

6 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

7 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendant Best Health Services, LLC dba Mid-
8 Wilshire Health Center and Does 1 through 50 (hereinafter also collectively referred to as
9 “Defendants”) for California Labor Code violations, unfair business practices, and civil penalties
10 stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay overtime compensation, failure to provide meal periods
11 or pay meal period premiums, failure to authorize and permit rest periods or pay rest period
12 premiums, failure to pay minimum wage, failure to timely pay wages, failure to provide accurate
13 wage statements, failure to maintain accurate time and payroll records, and failure to reimburse
14 necessary business-related expenses. In addition, this is a class action lawsuit seeking unpaid
15 wages and interest thereon for unpaid wages for all hours worked at minimum wage and overtime
16 worked at the overtime rate of pay due to Defendants’ policy, practice, and/or procedure of
17 rounding down or shaving down employees’ daily hours worked.

18 2. Plaintiff’s First through Eighth Causes of Action are brought as a class action on
19 behalf of herself and similarly situated current and former employees of Defendants (hereinafter
20 collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members,” as defined more fully in paragraph
21 12, below) pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages
22 and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court
23 and will be established according to proof at trial.

24 3. Plaintiff’s Ninth Cause of Action is brought as a representative action on behalf of
25 herself and certain other current and former individuals who performed work for Defendant as
26 employees in California during the statutory period (hereinafter collective referred to as the
27 “Aggrieved Employees”) pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2698, et seq. Plaintiff is an
28 aggrieved employee against whom one or more of the alleged violations occurred. The civil

penalties sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

4. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all other causes” except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

5. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief, Defendants are citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

6. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

7. The amount in controversy Plaintiff seeks on her own behalf in this lawsuit does not exceed \$75,000

PARTIES

8. Plaintiff Bria McMillan is an individual residing in the County of Los Angeles , State of California.

9. Defendant Best Health Services LLC dba Mid-Wilshire Health Center is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, and registered to do business in the state of California.

10. Plaintiff is ignorant of the identities of defendants Does 1 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. The Doe defendants may be individuals, partnerships, or corporations. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that, at all times mentioned herein, each of the Doe defendants was the parent, subsidiary, agent, servant, employee, co-venturer, and/or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, and was at all times mentioned acting within the scope, purpose, consent, knowledge, ratification and

1 authorization of such agency, employment, joint venture and conspiracy. Plaintiff will amend this
2 Complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and
3 believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named Doe defendants is responsible in
4 some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that Plaintiff's damages as herein alleged
5 were proximately caused by its conduct. Defendant Best Health Services LLC and Doe
6 Defendants 1 through 50 are collectively referred to herein as "Defendant."

7 11. Defendant was and at all times herein mentioned were, (a) conducting business in
8 the County of , State of California, and (b) the employer of Plaintiff consistent with the California
9 Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders ("Wage Orders").

10 12. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant, directly or indirectly controlled or affected
11 the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff and the
12 Class so as to make each of said Defendant employers and employers jointly liable under the
13 statutory provisions set forth herein.

14 13. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant, directly or indirectly controlled or affected
15 the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff, the
16 Class and the Aggrieved Employees so as to make each of said Defendant employers and
17 employers jointly liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

18 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

19 14. Plaintiff brings the First through Eighth Causes of Action as a class action on her
20 own behalf and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and, thus,
21 seeks class certification under Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

22 15. The proposed class is defined as follows: All current and former non-exempt
23 employees of any of Defendant within the State of California at any time commencing four (4)
24 years preceding the filing of Plaintiff's complaint up until the time that notice of the certified class
25 action is provided to the class (hereinafter referred to as the "Class" or "Class Members.").

26 16. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish other subclasses as appropriate.

27 17. The Class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in the
28 litigation:

- 1 a. Numerosity: The Class Members are so numerous that joinder of all Class
2 Members is impracticable. The membership of the entire Class is unknown to
3 Plaintiff at this time; however, the Class is estimated to be over fifty (50)
4 individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by
5 inspection of Defendants' employment records.
- 6 b. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of all other Class Members demonstrated
7 herein. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the other Class
8 Members with whom she has a well-defined community of interest.
- 9 c. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class
10 Member, with whom she has a well-defined community of interest and typicality
11 of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no interest that is antagonistic to
12 the other Class Members. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are
13 versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement.
14 Plaintiff has incurred, and during the pendency of this action will continue to
15 incur, costs and attorneys' fees, that have been, are, and will be necessarily
16 expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each Class
17 Member.
- 18 d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and
19 efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder of all Class
20 Members is impractical.
- 21 e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will
22 advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great state violate
23 employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to
24 assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. However, class
25 actions provide the Class Members who are not named in the complaint
26 anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights.

27 18. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class that predominate over
28 questions affecting only individual members. The following common questions of law or fact,

1 among others, exist as to the members of the Class:

- 2 a. Whether Defendant's failure to pay wages, without abatement, or reduction, in
3 accordance with the California Labor Code was willful;
- 4 b. Whether Defendant had a corporate policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff
5 and the other Class Members for all hours worked, and missed, short, late or
6 interrupted meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law;
- 7 c. Whether Defendant required Plaintiff and the other Class Members to work more
8 than eight (8) hours per day and/or more than forty (40) hours per week and failed
9 to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiff and the other Class
10 Members;
- 11 d. Whether Defendant deprived Plaintiff and the other Class Members of meal
12 and/or rest periods or required Plaintiff and the other Class Members to work
13 during meal and/or rest periods without compensation;
- 14 e. Whether Defendant failed to pay meal period premium wages to Class Members
15 when they were not provided with a legally compliant meal period;
- 16 f. Whether Defendant failed to pay rest period premium wages to Class Members
17 when they were not authorized and permitted to take legally compliant rest
18 periods;
- 19 g. Whether Defendant failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other Class
20 Members for all hours worked;
- 21 h. Whether Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members the
22 required minimum wage pursuant to California law;
- 23 i. Whether Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members proper
24 overtime compensation pursuant to California law;
- 25 j. Whether Defendant failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other Class
26 Members within the time required upon their discharge or resignation from
27 employment;
- 28 k. Whether Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other Class Members for

all necessary business-related expenses and costs in violation of California Labor Code section 2802;

1. Whether Defendant failed to pay reporting time wages in violation of the applicable IWC Wage Order;
- m. Whether Defendant failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other Class Members during their employment;
- n. Whether Defendant complied with wage reporting as required by the California Labor Code, including section 226;
- o. Whether Defendant's conduct was with malice, fraud or oppression;
- p. Whether Defendant's conduct was willful or reckless;
- q. Whether Defendant engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* based on their improper withholding of compensation and deduction of wages;
- r. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties resulting from Defendant's violation of California law; and
- s. Whether Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

PAGA ALLEGATIONS

19. At all times herein set forth, PAGA was applicable to Plaintiff's employment by Defendant.

20. At all times herein set forth, PAGA provides that any provision of law under the California Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA for violations of the California Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of themselves and other current or former employees pursuant to procedures outlined in California Labor Code section 2699.3.

21. Pursuant to PAGA, a civil action under PAGA may be brought by an "aggrieved employee," who is any person that was employed by the alleged violator and against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed.

1 22. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant and the alleged violations were committed
2 against her during her time of employment and she is, therefore, an aggrieved employee. Plaintiff
3 and the other employees are “Aggrieved Employees” as defined by California Labor Code section
4 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees of Defendant, and one or more of the
5 alleged violations were committed against them.

6 23. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, aggrieved
7 employees, including Plaintiff, may pursue a civil action arising under PAGA after the following
8 requirements have been met:

9 a. The aggrieved employee shall give written notice by online submission
10 (hereinafter “Employee’s Notice”) to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency (hereinafter
11 “LWDA”) and by U.S. Certified Mail to the employer of the specific provisions of the California
12 Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged
13 violations.

14 b. The LWDA shall provide notice (hereinafter “LWDA Notice”) to the
15 employer and the aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not intend to investigate the
16 alleged violation within sixty (60) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee’s Notice.
17 Upon receipt of the LWDA Notice, or if the LWDA Notice is not provided within sixty-five (65)
18 calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee’s Notice, the aggrieved employee may
19 commence a civil action pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699 to recover civil penalties
20 in addition to any other penalties to which the employee may be entitled.

21 24. On September 29, 2025, Plaintiff provided written notice by online submission to
22 the LWDA and by U.S. Certified Mail to Defendant of the specific provisions of the California
23 Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged
24 violations. Plaintiff has not received an LWDA Notice within sixty-five (65) calendar days of
25 the date of Plaintiff’s notice.

26 25. Therefore, Plaintiff has satisfied the administrative prerequisites under California
27 Labor Code section 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendant, in addition to other
28 remedies, for violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510,

512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

26. Defendant operates a nursing home facility in Los Angeles, California entitled Mid-Wilshire Health Center.

27. Defendant employed Plaintiff to work as an hourly, non-exempt employee whose job title has been “Dietary Supervisor” since approximately on or about October 2024. Her job duties included, but were not limited to, checking on the weight and health of residents, monitor meal plans, kitchen management, and perform diet aid duties.

28. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendant employed Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees.

29. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendant had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees; to directly or indirectly control work rules, working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees; and to hire and terminate the employment of Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

30. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant was subject to the Labor Code of the State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

31. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees worked more minutes per shift than Defendants credited them with having worked, which resulted in them working for periods of time in which they were not paid at the minimum wage or overtime rate, as well as not taking proper and compliant meal breaks. Defendants “rounded” down or “shaved” Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees’s total daily hours worked at the time of their clock-in and clock-out to the nearest quarter (or tenth) of an hour, to the benefit of Defendants, in policy and/or practice. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were not paid for this time. Despite the fact that California law requires employers to pay employees for all hours worked at least at a minimum wage rate, Defendants rounded down or shaved down Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees’s daily hours worked, Defendants suffered, permitted, and required its hourly employees to be subject to Defendant’s control without paying wages for that time. This

1 resulted in Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees's working time for which they were
2 not compensated any wages, in violation of California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and the
3 Wage Orders.

4 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that Defendant engaged in
5 an ongoing and systematic scheme of wage abuse against their hourly-paid or non-exempt
6 employees. As set forth in more detail below, this scheme involved, *inter alia*, regularly requiring
7 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock without compensation,
8 thereby failing to pay them for all hours worked, including minimum and overtime wages.
9 Defendant also implemented policies that prohibited Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
10 Employees from accurately recording the actual time worked, resulting in a failure to pay
11 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all wages owed. In addition, Defendant
12 routinely failed to permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and
13 duty-free meal periods and rest periods in violation of California law. Defendant also failed to
14 reimburse Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business-related
15 expenses, and failed to pay reporting wages.

16 33. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendant implemented policies
17 and/or practices which failed to provide Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with
18 timely and duty-free meal periods. Defendant routinely failed to relieve Plaintiff, the Class, and
19 the Aggrieved Employees of all duties during their meal periods, regularly failed to relinquish
20 control over Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees during their meal periods,
21 regularly failed to permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees a reasonable
22 opportunity to take their meal periods, and regularly impeded or discouraged Plaintiff, the Class,
23 and the Aggrieved Employees from taking thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal breaks no later
24 than the end of their fifth hour of work and/or from taking a second thirty (30) minute
25 uninterrupted meal break no later than their tenth hour of work for shifts lasting more than ten
26 (10) hours. Defendant also failed to maintain accurate records of meal periods taken by Plaintiff,
27 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

28 34. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees worked more minutes per shift than

Defendants credited them with having worked. Defendants “rounded” down or “shaved” Plaintiff’s and similarly situated employees’ total daily hours worked at the time of their clock-in and clock-out to the nearest quarter of an hour, to the benefit of Defendants, in policy and/or practice. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were not paid for this time. Despite the fact that California law requires employers to pay employees for all hours worked at least at a minimum wage rate, Defendants rounded down or shaved down Plaintiff’s and similarly situated employees’ daily hours worked, Defendants suffered, permitted, and required its hourly employees to be subject to Defendant’s control without paying wages for that time. This result in Plaintiff and similarly situated employees working time for which they were not compensated any wages, in violation of California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and the Wage Orders.

35. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take meal periods under California law. Moreover, Defendant systematically disregarded their own written policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees. Instead, Defendant’s actual policy and practice was to schedule Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in a way that prohibited them from taking timely and duty-free meal periods, and to require Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work through their meal periods, for which they were not compensated.

36. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees premium wages for meal periods that were missed, late, interrupted, or shortened in violation of California law. Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, short, late, and/or interrupted. Notwithstanding this knowledge, Defendant routinely failed to provide legally compliant meal periods to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees, and routinely failed to pay one additional hour of pay to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at their regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, short, late, and/or interrupted.

1 37. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants have implemented
2 policies and practices which prohibited Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees from
3 taking timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendant regularly failed to provide, authorize, and
4 permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take full, uninterrupted, off-duty rest
5 periods for every shift lasting three and one-half (3.5) to six (6) hours and/or two full,
6 uninterrupted, off-duty rest periods for every shift lasting six (6) to ten (10) hours, and failed to
7 make a good faith effort to authorize, permit, and provide such rest breaks in the middle of each
8 work period.

9 38. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendant did not adequately
10 inform Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take rest periods under
11 California law. Moreover, Defendant systematically disregarded their own written policies
12 regarding the provision and timing of rest periods for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
13 Employees. Instead, Defendant's actual policy and practice was to schedule Plaintiff, the Class,
14 and the Aggrieved Employees in a way that regularly prohibited them from taking timely and
15 duty free rest periods, and to regularly require Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
16 to work through their rest periods.

17 39. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff,
18 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees premium wages for rest periods that were missed, late,
19 interrupted, or shortened in violation of California law. Defendant knew or should have known
20 that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all rest periods or
21 payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed,
22 short, late, and/or interrupted. Notwithstanding this knowledge, Defendant routinely failed to
23 authorize and permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take duty-free rest
24 periods, and failed to pay one additional hour of pay to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
25 Employees at their regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, short, late and/or
26 interrupted.

27 40. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendant implemented policies
28 that prohibited Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees from accurately recording the

1 actual time worked, resulting in a failure to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
2 all wages owed.

3 41. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Plaintiff, the Class, and the
4 Aggrieved Employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a day, and/or forty (40) hours in a
5 week. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendant regularly failed to pay all
6 overtime compensation owed to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees when they
7 worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a single work day and/or forty (40) hours in a single work
8 week, or in excess of twelve (12) hours in a single work day and/or eighty (80) hours in a single
9 work week. Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
10 Employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation and that they were
11 not receiving wages for overtime compensation.

12 42. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendant failed to pay overtime
13 to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on
14 regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration.

15 43. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendant regularly failed to
16 pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at least minimum wages for all hours
17 worked. Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
18 Employees were entitled to receive at least minimum wages for all hours worked and that they
19 were not receiving at least minimum wages for all hours worked. Defendant's failure to pay
20 minimum wages included, *inter alia*, failing to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
21 Employees at the required minimum wage pursuant to California law, requiring Plaintiff, the
22 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work off the clock.

23 44. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendant regularly failed to
24 pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all wages within any time permissible
25 under California law, including, *inter alia*, California Labor Code section 204. Defendant knew
26 or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to
27 receive all wages owed to them during their employment. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
28 Employees did not receive payment of all wages, including overtime compensation, minimum

1 wages, and meal and rest period premiums.

2 45. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendant regularly failed to
3 provide complete or accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
4 Employees. Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
5 Employees were entitled to receive complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with
6 California law, but, in fact, they did not receive complete and accurate wage statements from
7 Defendant. The deficiencies included, *inter alia*, the failure to include the total number of hours
8 worked, the actual gross wages earned, the correct rates of pay, and the address of the legal entity
9 of the employer.

10 46. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendant regularly failed to
11 keep complete or accurate payroll records for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.
12 Defendant knew or should have known that Defendant was required to keep complete and
13 accurate payroll records for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in accordance with
14 California law, but, in fact, did not keep complete and accurate payroll records.

15 47. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendant regularly failed to
16 maintain accurate records relating to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees's work
17 periods, meal periods, total daily hours, hours per pay period, and applicable pay rates.

18 48. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendant failed to reimburse
19 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business-related expenses.
20 Defendant knew or should have known that Defendant was required to reimburse Plaintiff, the
21 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business-related expenses and costs, but,
22 in fact, failed to do so in violation of California law.

23 49. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendant knew or should have
24 known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
25 pursuant to California law. Defendant had the financial ability to pay such compensation, but
26 willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely represented to Plaintiff, the
27 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees that they paid all wages owed to them, all in order to increase
28 Defendant's profits.

50. California Labor Code section 218 states that nothing in Article 1 of the Labor Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to “sue directly ... for any wages or penalty due to him [or her] under this article.”

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198

(Against All Defendants)

51. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and every allegation set forth above.

52. California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person’s regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

53. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendant is and was required to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members employed by Defendant, and working more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, at the rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

54. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendant is and was required to pay Plaintiff and the Class overtime compensation at a rate of two times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh day of work in a workweek.

55. California Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-and-one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work, and no overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day of work.

56. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other Class Members regularly worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a week.

1 applicable order of the California IWC.

2 65. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code
3 section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work
4 for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with a meal
5 period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the
6 employee is no more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of
7 both the employer and employee.

8 66. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 512(a) further provides that
9 an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a work period of more
10 than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal
11 period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than
12 twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and
13 the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

14 67. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other Class Members who were
15 scheduled to work for a period of time longer than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their
16 legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than
17 five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

18 68. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other Class Members who were
19 scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of ten (10) hours were required to work for
20 periods longer than ten (10) hours without a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than
21 thirty (30) minutes.

22 69. During the relevant time period, Defendants “rounded” down or “shaved” Plaintiff
23 and similarly situated employees’ total number of hours (or fraction thereof) in which they took
24 lunch. This policy of rounding meal periods made it such that Plaintiff and other similarly situated
25 employees were not provided with legally compliant meal breaks and were not paid meal period
26 premiums for any meal breaks that were less than thirty (30) minutes in duration.

27 70. During the relevant time period, Defendant intentionally and willfully required
28 Plaintiff and the other Class Members to miss their meal periods and to take meal periods that

were late, shortened, or interrupted, and failed to compensate Plaintiff and the other Class Members the full meal period premium for missed, shortened, late, or interrupted meal periods.

71. During the relevant time period, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members the full meal period premiums due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.

72. Defendant's conduct violates the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

73. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7(b), Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendant one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the meal period was not provided.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226.7

(Against All Defendants)

74. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and every allegation set forth above.

75. At all times herein set forth, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiff and the other Class Members' employment by Defendant.

76. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

77. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that "[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period" and that the "rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3.5) hours."

86. Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members the minimum wage as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Pursuant to those sections, Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum wage compensation as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees, and liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

87. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 204 and 210

(Against All Defendants)

88. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and every allegation set forth above

89. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed.

90. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

91. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period.

92. During the relevant time period, Defendant intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and other Class Members all wages due to them, within any time period permissible under California Labor Code section 204.

93. Plaintiff and other Class Members are entitled to recover all available remedies for

1 Defendant's violations of California Labor Code section 204, including statutory penalties
2 pursuant to Labor Code section 210(b).

3 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226(a)**

5 **(Against All Defendants)**

6 94. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and
7 every allegation set forth above.

8 95. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code section 226(a)
9 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized
10 statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3)
11 the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a
12 piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the
13 employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates
14 of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her social
15 security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all
16 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
17 worked at each hourly rate by the employee. The deductions made from payments of wages shall
18 be recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly dated, showing the month, day, and year, and
19 a copy of the statement or a record of the deductions shall be kept on file by the employer for at
20 least three years at the place of employment or at a central location within the State of California.

21 96. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the
22 Class with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, but are not limited
23 to the failure list the total number of hours worked, and the actual gross wages earned.

24 97. Because of Defendant's violation of California Labor Code section 226(a),
25 Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

26 98. More specifically, Plaintiff and the Class have been injured by Defendant's
27 intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) because they were
28 denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate and

1 itemized wage statements pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(a).

2 99. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of their
3 actual damages caused by Defendant's failure to comply with California Labor Code section
4 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars per employee.

5 100. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief to ensure compliance
6 with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(g).

7 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802**

9 **(Against All Defendants)**

10 101. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and
11 every allegation set forth above.

12 102. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must
13 reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct
14 consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her job
15 duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

16 103. Plaintiff and the Class incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that
17 were not fully reimbursed by Defendant. Defendant's failure to reimburse for all necessary
18 business-related expenses and costs included their failure to reimburse Plaintiff and the Class for
19 costs incurred as a result of, including but not limited to, simple negligence.

20 104. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the
21 Class for all necessary business-related expenses and costs. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to
22 recover from Defendant their business-related expenses and costs incurred during the course and
23 scope of their employment, plus interest accrued from the date on which the employee incurred
24 the necessary expenditures at the same rate as judgments in civil actions in the State of California.

25 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **Violation of Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.**

27 **(Against All Defendants)**

28 105. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and

1 every allegation set forth above.

2 106. Defendant's conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
3 unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff and the Class, to the general public, and Defendant's
4 competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest
5 within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

6 107. Defendant's activities as alleged herein are violations of California law, and
7 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions
8 Code section 17200, *et seq.*

9 108. A violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* may
10 be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendant's policies
11 and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the Class, to work overtime without
12 paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.
13 Additionally, Defendant's policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and
14 the Class, to work through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper compensation
15 violate California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Moreover, Defendant's policies and
16 practices of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the Class violate California Labor Code
17 section 204.

18 109. Defendant also violated California Labor Code sections 221, 226(a), 1194, 1197,
19 1197.1, 510, 1174(d), 2800, and 2802.

20 110. As a result of the herein described violations of California law, Defendant
21 unlawfully gained an unfair advantage over other businesses.

22 111. Plaintiff and the Class have been personally injured by Defendant's unlawful
23 business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not necessarily limited to the loss of
24 money and/or property.

25 112. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*,
26 Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendant
27 during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this Complaint; an award of
28 attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and other applicable

1 laws; and an award of costs.

2 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

3 **Violation of California Labor Code § 2699, Et Seq. (“Private Attorneys General Act”)**

4 **(Against All Defendants)**

5 113. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and
6 every allegation set forth above.

7 114. PAGA expressly establishes that any provision of the California Labor Code
8 which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA, or any of its
9 departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for a violation of the
10 California Labor Code, may be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved
11 employee on behalf of himself or herself, and other current or former employees.

12 115. Whenever the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
13 agencies, or employees has discretion to assess a civil penalty, a court in a civil action is
14 authorized to exercise the same discretion, subject to the same limitations and conditions, to assess
15 a civil penalty.

16 116. Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees or individuals who
17 performed work for Defendant during the statutory period are “aggrieved employees” as defined
18 by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees of
19 Defendant, and one or more of the alleged violations was committed against them. As set forth in
20 detail above, during all times relevant to this Action, Defendant has routinely subjected Plaintiff
21 and the Aggrieved Employees to violations of California Labor Codes by:

22 **Failure to Pay Overtime**

23 117. Defendant’s failure to pay legally required overtime wages to Plaintiff and the
24 other Aggrieved Employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or unfair
25 activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.

26 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

27 118. Defendant’s failure to provide legally required meal periods to Plaintiff and the
28 other Aggrieved Employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or unfair

activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

Failure to Provide Rest Periods

119. Defendant's failure to provide legally required rest periods to Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 226.7.

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

120. Defendant's failure to pay legally required minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination

121. Defendant's failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees upon termination in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 and 202 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

122. Defendant's failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees during employment in accordance with Labor Code section 204 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 204.

Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements

123. Defendant's failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees in accordance with Labor Code section 226(a) constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 226(a).

Failure to Keep Complete and Accurate Payroll Records

124. Defendant's failure to keep complete and accurate payroll records relating to Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees in accordance with California Labor Code section 1174(d) constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 1174(d).

//

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business-Related Expenses and Costs

125. Defendants' failure to reimburse Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees for necessary business-related expenses and costs in accordance with California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.

126. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, requests and is entitled to recover from Defendant and each of them, business expenses, unpaid wages, and/or untimely wages according to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.5, as well as all statutory penalties against Defendant, and each of them, including but not limited to:

- a. Penalties under California Labor Code section 2699 in the amount of a 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;
- b. Penalties under California Code of Regulations Title 8 section 11010, et seq. in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each subsequent violation; and
- c. Penalties under California Labor Code section 210 in addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the California Labor Code in the amount of a 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; and
- d. Any and all additional penalties and sums as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

127. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(i), civil penalties recovered by aggrieved employees shall be distributed as follows: seventy-five percent (75%) to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency for the enforcement of labor laws and education of employers

1 and employees about their rights and responsibilities and twenty-five percent (25%) to the
2 aggrieved employees.

3 128. Further, Plaintiff is entitled to seek and recover reasonable attorneys' fees and
4 costs pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210, 218.5 and 2699 and any other applicable
5 statute.

6 129. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies pursuant to Labor Code
7 section 2699.3. On September 29, 2025, Plaintiff, through her counsel of record, by online filing
8 with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and by certified mail to the
9 Defendant, notified Defendant and the LWDA of the specific provisions of the Labor Code and
10 IWC Wage Orders that Defendant has violated, including the facts and theories to support the
11 violations, and of Plaintiff's intent to bring a claim for civil penalties under PAGA. Plaintiff also
12 paid the filing fee required under Labor Code section 2699.3. As of the filing of this Complaint,
13 more than sixty-five (65) days have elapsed since the mailing of Plaintiff's September 29, 2025
14 notice, and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to
15 investigate the violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil
16 action to recover penalties for herself and other Aggrieved Employees pursuant to Labor Code
17 section 2699.3.

18 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

19 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all other members of the general
20 public similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against Defendant, jointly and severally,
21 as follows:

22
23 **Class Certification**

- 24 1. That this action be certified as a class action;
- 25 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class;
- 26 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel; and
- 27 4. That Defendant provide to Class Counsel immediately the names and most
28 current/last known contact information (address, e-mail and telephone numbers) of all class

members.

As to the First Cause of Action

5. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due to Plaintiff and other Class Members;

6. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

7. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194; and

9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Second Cause of Action

10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiff and the Class;

11. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the Class of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not provided;

12. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

13. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7;

14. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

15. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

16. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Third Cause of Action

17. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California

1 Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all rest
2 periods to Plaintiff and the Class;

3 18. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the Class of one (1) hour of pay at
4 each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not
5 provided;

6 19. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
7 proof;

8 20. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7;

9 21. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were
10 due; and

11 22. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

12 **As to the Fourth Cause of Action**

13 23. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California
14 Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to
15 Plaintiff and the Class;

16 24. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be
17 appropriate;

18 25. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1 for
19 Plaintiff and the Class in the amount as may be established according to proof at trial;

20 26. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts
21 were due;

22 27. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
23 California Labor Code section 1194(a);

24 28. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2; and

25 29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

26 **As to the Fifth Cause of Action**

27 30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California
28 Labor Code section 204 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time required by

California Labor Code section 204 to Plaintiff and the Class;

31. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 210;

32. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

33. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code section 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders as to Plaintiff and the Class, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

34. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

35. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(e); and

36. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

37. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the Class for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

38. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

39. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;

40. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

41. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

42. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.* by failing to provide Plaintiff and the Class all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the Class, failing to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiff and the Class, failing to pay Plaintiff's and other Class Members' wages timely as required by California Labor Code section 204 and by violating California Labor Code sections 226(a), 1174(d), 2800, and 2802;

43. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and the Class and all pre-judgment

1 interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

2 44. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all
3 funds disgorged from Defendant and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendant
4 as a result of violation of California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*;

5 45. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
6 California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;

7 46. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California
8 Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*; and

9 47. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

10 **As to the Ninth Cause of Action**

11 48. For civil penalties and wages as permitted by law pursuant to California Labor
12 Code sections 2699(a), (f) and (g) and 558 plus costs and attorneys' fees for violation of California
13 Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
14 1198, 1198.5, 2800 and 2802; and

15 49. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

16
17 Dated: December 12, 2025

DOMB & RAUCHWERGER, LLP

18
19 By: 

ZACK I. DOMB
DEVIN E. RAUCHWERGER
ERIC Y. HAHN
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Bria McMillan

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by a jury.

Dated: December 12, 2025

DOMB & RAUCHWERGER, LLP

By: 

ZACK I. DOMB
DEVIN E. RAUCHWERGER
ERIC Y. HAHN
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Bria McMillan

I, the undersigned, am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; am employed with Domb & Rauchwerger LLP and my business address is 1055 East Colorado Blvd., Fifth Floor, Pasadena, California 91106. My e-mail address is jessica@dombrauchwerger.com.

• **FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**

Wilshire Health Center

- Signature _____