

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)  
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)  
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)  
Margaux K. Gundzik, Esq. (SBN 340116)  
Keith A. Lollis, Esq. (SBN 352561)  
**LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP**  
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200  
Beverly Hills, California 90211  
Telephone: (310) 432-0000  
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001  
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com  
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com  
jklein@lelawfirm.com  
mgundzik@lelawfirm.com  
klollis@lelawfirm.com

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**  
Superior Court of California,  
County of Alameda  
**12/03/2025 at 07:15:17 PM**  
By: Andrel Gospel,  
Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff XOCHITL OVANDO,  
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees

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

XOCHITL OVANDO, on behalf of herself and  
current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

GT'S LIVING FOODS, LLC; and DOES 1 to  
100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **25CV157723**

**PAGA ACTION**

**PLAINTIFF XOCHITL OVANDO'S  
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

**COMES NOW** Plaintiff XOCHITL OVANDO ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains  
against Defendants GT'S LIVING FOODS, LLC; 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  
and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-exempt

employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated with Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all hours worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant meal periods or pay meal period premium wages; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or pay rest period premium wages; indemnification for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by employees in direct consequence of discharging their duties; statutory penalties for failure to timely pay earned wages during employment; statutory penalties for failure to provide accurate wage statements; statutory waiting time penalties in the form of continuation wages for failure to timely pay employees all wages due upon separation of employment. . Plaintiff experienced these violations personally, as well as is informed and believes other aggrieved employees did as well. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

## **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of thirty-five thousand dollars (\$35,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout California, including but not limited to Alameda County, at 3000 East 9th St, Oakland, CA, 94601.

## **III. PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency on behalf of herself and other current and former employees subject to violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work

1 for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp  
2 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently  
3 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by  
4 Defendants in an hourly position from in or around January 1, 2022, until on or about July 16, 2025.

5 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant GT'S LIVING  
6 FOODS, LLC is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business in  
7 the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant hereto were  
8 persons acting on behalf of Defendant GT'S LIVING FOODS, LLC in the establishment of, or  
9 ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant GT'S  
10 LIVING FOODS, LLC operates in Alameda County and employed aggrieved employees in  
11 Alameda County, including but not limited to, at 3000 East 9th St, Oakland, CA, 94601.

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

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

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

6. 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 PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF  
2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

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

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

8. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1198, 2802, and the applicable Wage Orders.

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

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

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

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

1 to:

2 (a) Sometimes Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly  
3 non-exempt employees were required to clock out for their meal breaks and continue to work  
4 through their off-the-clock meal breaks.

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

11 14. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that  
12 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
13 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
14 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

15 15. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay**  
16 **and/or failure to pay overtime wages at the proper rate of pay:** Defendants employed many of  
17 their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt employees. In California, an employer  
18 is required to pay hourly employees for all "hours worked," which includes all time that an employee  
19 is under control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered and permitted to work. This  
20 includes the time an employee spends, either directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to  
21 the benefit of the employer.'

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

25 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40) hours  
26 in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in  
27 any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-one-half  
28 (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve (12) hours  
in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay  
for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a  
workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an  
employee.

1 Labor Code section 510.

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

5 (a) Sometimes Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly  
6 non-exempt employees were required to clock out for their meal breaks and continue to work  
7 through their off-the-clock meal breaks.

8 18. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that  
9 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
10 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
11 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

12 19. The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each  
13 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt  
14 employees were under the control of Defendants but were not compensated. To the extent that the  
15 foregoing uncompensated time occurred when Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved  
16 California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday,  
17 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendants failed  
18 to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code  
19 sections 510, 1194 and 1198, and the applicable Wage Order.

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

25 21. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an  
26 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of  
27 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the  
28 employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 4 at §11;

1 *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ  
2 an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee  
3 with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh  
4 hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period  
5 shall be considered an “on duty” meal period and counted as time worked. A paid “on duty” meal  
6 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved  
7 of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

8         22. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the  
9 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay  
10 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code  
11 sections 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 4 at §11.

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

16                 (a) Sometimes Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly  
17 non-exempt employees were required to clock out for their meal breaks and continue to work  
18 through their off-the-clock meal breaks.

19                 (b) Sometimes failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved  
20 California-based hourly non-exempt employees timely, uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at  
21 least 30 minutes for every five hours worked.

22                 (c) Sometimes failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved  
23 California-based hourly non-exempt employees a second uninterrupted duty-free meal period of no  
24 less than thirty (30) minutes for each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved  
25 California-based hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

26         24. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or  
27 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
28 hourly non-exempt employees one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday that

1 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees did  
2 not receive legally required and compliant meal periods, in violation of Labor Code section 226.7.

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

7 26. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that  
8 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
9 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
10 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

15 28. 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 Code  
17 section 226.7; Wage Order 4 at §12. Under California law, "[e]mployees are entitled to 10 minutes'  
18 rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six  
19 hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on." *Brinker*  
20 *Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code section 226.7;  
21 Wage Order 4 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each work period.  
22 Wage Order 4 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement "“obligates employers to permit –  
23 and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*  
24 (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all  
25 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

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



1 Order 4 at § 12.

2 30. 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) Sometimes failing to provide Plaintiffs and other current and former aggrieved  
7 California-based hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four  
8 (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof.

9 (b) Sometimes failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved  
10 California-based hourly non-exempt employees a third uninterrupted duty-free rest period of no less  
11 than ten (10) net minutes on each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved  
12 California-based hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

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

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

22 33. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that  
23 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
24 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
25 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

26 34. **Failure to Indemnify for Losses and Expenditures Incurred as Part of**  
27 **Employment:** California law requires that every employer must indemnify its employees for all  
28 necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in discharge of his or her duties or at the

1 obedience of the directions of the employer. Moreover, an employer is prohibited from passing the  
2 ordinary business expenses and losses of the employer onto the employee. (Lab. Code, § 2802.)

3 35. Defendants have violated Labor Code Section 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiff  
4 and other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees' necessary  
5 expenditures they incurred in the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendants employed  
6 policies, practices, and/or procedures included, but not limited to:

7 (a) Sometimes requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-  
8 based hourly non-exempt employees to use or purchase their own tools and/or resources in order to  
9 work for Defendants, including but not limited to their cell phone (including both telephone use and  
10 cellular data use) for work-related purposes – without reimbursing Plaintiff and other current and  
11 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees for such use.

12 36. Moreover, Defendants employed policies and procedures which ensured Plaintiff and  
13 aggrieved employees would not receive indemnification for their employment related expenses.  
14 This practice resulted in Plaintiff and aggrieved employees not receiving such indemnification in  
15 compliance with California law.

16 37. Therefore, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for their  
17 employment related expenses, including but not limited to costs related to use of their personal cell  
18 phones and costs associated with their uniforms pursuant to Labor Code section 2802.

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

23 39. **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 earned  
26 between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 16th and  
27 the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any  
28 calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. *Id.* Other payroll

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

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

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

14 42. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section  
15 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated  
16 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage  
17 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by  
18 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful  
19 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,  
20 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor  
21 Code section 1198, the Defendant secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while  
22 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

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

26 44. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section  
27 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an employee  
28 his or her wages, the employer must "furnish each of his or her employees ... an itemized statement

1 in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any  
2 employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of  
3 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare  
4 Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee  
5 is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all deductions made on written orders  
6 of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive  
7 dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her  
8 social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all  
9 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours  
10 worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

11 45. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff  
12 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages  
13 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period  
14 premium wages) rendered Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
15 hourly non-exempt employees’ wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section  
16 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

17 46. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

18 47. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
19 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
20 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

25 49. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, because Defendants failed to pay  
26 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all  
27 their earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages,  
28 and/or rest period premium wages), Defendants failed to pay those employees timely after each

1 employee's termination and/or resignation, in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

2 50. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

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

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

10 53. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code  
11 section 2699.3. On September 25, 2025, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and  
12 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of  
13 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the  
14 violations alleged.

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

20 55. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil  
21 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7,  
22 510, 512, 1194, and 1198., During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present,  
23 preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the  
24 following amounts:

25 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, 1198, and  
26 2802; one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation  
27 and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent  
28 violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].



1 Labor Code, including but not limited to sections 210, 225.5, 226.3, 558, 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: December 3, 2025

Respectfully submitted,  
**LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP**

8

9

By: /s/ Margaux K. Gundzik

10

Joseph Lavi, Esq.

Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.

11

Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.

Margaux K. Gundzik, Esq.

12

Keith A. Lollis, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiff

13

XOCHITL OVANDO

on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved  
employees

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28