

Arby Aiwarzian (SBN 269827)  
**LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC**  
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203  
Glendale, California 91203  
Tel: (818) 265-1020  
Fax: (818) 265-1021

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

ELECTRONICALLY  
**FILED**  
Superior Court of California,  
County of San Francisco

**05/18/2023**  
Clerk of the Court  
BY: JEFFREY FLORES  
Deputy Clerk

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

**CGC-23-606609**

MICHAELA GOSLIN, individually, and on  
behalf of other aggrieved employees  
pursuant to the California Private Attorneys  
General Act;

Plaintiff,

vs.

DOMA TITLE OF CALIFORNIA, INC., a  
California limited liability company; DOMA  
HOLDINGS, INC., an unknown business  
entity; NORTH AMERICAN TITLE  
INSURANCE COMPANY, an unknown  
business entity; NORTH AMERICAN  
SERVICES, LLC, a California limited  
liability company; STATES TITLE  
HOLDING, INC., a Delaware corporation  
and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR ENFORCEMENT  
UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS  
GENERAL ACT, CALIFORNIA LABOR  
CODE § 2698, ET SEQ.**

Violation of California Labor Code §  
2698, et seq. (California Labor Code  
Private Attorneys General Act of 2004)

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

COMES NOW, Plaintiff MICHAELA GOSLIN (“Plaintiff”), individually, and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act, and alleges as follows:

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

1. This representative action is brought pursuant to the California Labor Code section 2698, et seq. The civil penalties sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial. The “amount in controversy” for the named Plaintiff, including claims for compensatory damages, restitution, penalties, wages, premium pay, and pro rata share of attorneys’ fees, is less than seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000).

2. This 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.

3. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief, each Defendant is a citizen of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avails itself of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

4. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, each Defendant maintains offices, has agents, and/or transacts business in the State of California, including the County of San Francisco. The majority of the acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees took place in the State of California, including the County of San Francisco.

**PARTIES**

5. Plaintiff MICHAELA GOSLIN is an individual residing in the State of California.

///

6. Defendant DOMA TITLE OF CALIFORNIA, INC. at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of San Francisco.

7. Defendant DOMA HOLDINGS, INC. at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of San Francisco.

8. Defendant NORTH AMERICAN TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of San Francisco.

9. Defendant NORTH AMERICAN SERVICES, LLC at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of San Francisco.

10. Defendant STATES TITLE HOLDING, INC. at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of San Francisco.

11. At all relevant times, Defendants DOMA TITLE OF CALIFORNIA, INC., DOMA HOLDINGS, INC., NORTH AMERICAN TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY, NORTH AMERICAN SERVICES, LLC, and STATES TITLE HOLDING, INC. were the “employer” of Plaintiff within the meaning of all applicable state laws and statutes.

12. At all times herein relevant, DOMA TITLE OF CALIFORNIA, INC., DOMA HOLDINGS, INC., NORTH AMERICAN TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY, NORTH AMERICAN SERVICES, LLC, STATES TITLE HOLDING, INC., and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, were the agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators and/or assigns, and all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly

committed with the ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization and/or consent of each defendant designated as a DOE herein.

13. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual or otherwise, of defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff who sues said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based on that information and belief alleges, that each of the defendants designated as a DOE is legally responsible for the events and happenings referred to in this Complaint, and unlawfully caused the injuries and damages to Plaintiff as alleged in this Complaint. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to show the true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

14. DOMA TITLE OF CALIFORNIA, INC., DOMA HOLDINGS, INC., NORTH AMERICAN TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY, NORTH AMERICAN SERVICES, LLC, STATES TITLE HOLDING, INC., and DOES 1 through 100 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as "Defendants."

15. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants including the unknown defendants identified as DOES, directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees so as to make each of said Defendants employers and employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

### **PAGA ALLEGATIONS**

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

17. 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 herself and other current or former employees pursuant to procedures outlined in California Labor Code section 2699.3.

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

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

9           20. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, an aggrieved  
10 employee, including Plaintiff, may pursue a civil action arising under PAGA after the  
11 following requirements have been met:

- 12           a. The aggrieved employee shall give written notice by online submission  
13 (hereinafter “Employee’s Notice”) to the Labor & Workforce  
14 Development Agency (hereinafter “LWDA”) and by U.S. Certified  
15 Mail to the employer of the specific provisions of the California Labor  
16 Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to  
17 support the alleged violations.
- 18           b. The LWDA shall provide notice (hereinafter “LWDA Notice”) to the  
19 employer and the aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not  
20 intend to investigate the alleged violation within sixty (60) calendar  
21 days of the postmark date of the Employee’s Notice. Upon receipt of  
22 the LWDA Notice, or if the LWDA Notice is not provided within  
23 sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee’s  
24 Notice, the aggrieved employee may commence a civil action pursuant  
25 to California Labor Code section 2699 to recover civil penalties in  
26 addition to any other penalties to which the employee may be entitled.

27           21. On March 14, 2023, Plaintiff provided written notice by online submission to  
28 the LWDA and by U.S. Certified Mail to Defendants DOMA TITLE OF CALIFORNIA,

INC., DOMA HOLDINGS, INC., NORTH AMERICAN TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY, NORTH AMERICAN SERVICES, LLC, and STATES TITLE HOLDING, INC. of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. Plaintiff has not received an LWDA Notice within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the date of Plaintiff's notice.

22. Therefore, Plaintiff has satisfied the administrative prerequisites under California Labor Code section 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendants for violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802.

### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

23. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other aggrieved hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked for any of the Defendants in the State of California, including, but not limited to all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked for any of the Defendants within the State of California who earned shift differentials/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay which was not used to calculate the correct regular rate of pay used to calculate the overtime rate (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "other aggrieved employees").

24. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately August 2021 to approximately October 2022 in the State of California, County of San Francisco.

25. Defendants hired Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees, and failed to compensate them for all hours worked, missed meal periods or rest breaks.

26. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff's and the other aggrieved employees' employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

27. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's and the other aggrieved employees' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees.

1           28.     Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff and the  
2 other aggrieved employees.

3           29.     Defendants continue to employ hourly-paid or non-exempt employees, within  
4 the State of California.

5           30.     Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees worked over eight (8) hours in a  
6 day, and/or forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.

7           31.     Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
8 engaged in a uniform policy and systematic scheme of wage abuse against their hourly-paid  
9 or non-exempt employees. This scheme involved, *inter alia*, failing to pay them for all hours  
10 worked and for missed (short, late, interrupted, and altogether missed) meal periods and rest  
11 breaks in violation of California law.

12          32.     Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
13 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to  
14 receive certain wages for overtime compensation and that they were not receiving wages for  
15 overtime compensation.

16          33.     Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
17 failed to provide Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees the required rest and meal  
18 periods during the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission  
19 Wage Orders and thus they are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

20          34.     Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
21 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to  
22 receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other  
23 aggrieved employee's regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, and they did not  
24 receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other  
25 aggrieved employee's regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed.

26          35.     Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
27 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to  
28 receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other

1 aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, and they did not  
2 receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other  
3 aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed.

4         36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
5 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to  
6 receive at least minimum wages for compensation and that they were not receiving at least  
7 minimum wages for all hours worked.

8         37. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
9 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to  
10 receive all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including overtime and  
11 minimum wages and meal and rest period premiums, and they did not, in fact, receive all  
12 such wages owed to them at the time of their discharge.

13         38. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
14 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to  
15 receive all wages owed to them during their employment. Plaintiff and the other aggrieved  
16 employees did not receive payment of all wages, including overtime and minimum wages  
17 and meal and rest period premiums, within any time permissible under California Labor  
18 Code section 204.

19         39. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
20 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to  
21 receive complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but, in  
22 fact, they did not receive complete and accurate wage statements from Defendants. The  
23 deficiencies included, *inter alia*, the failure to include the total number of hours worked by  
24 Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees.

25         40. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
26 knew or should have known that Defendants had to keep complete and accurate payroll  
27 records for Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with California law,  
28 but, in fact, did not keep complete and accurate payroll records.

1           41. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
2 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to  
3 reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses and costs.

4           42. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
5 knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and the other  
6 aggrieved employees pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had the financial ability  
7 to pay such compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and  
8 falsely represented to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees that they were properly  
9 denied wages, all in order to increase Defendants' profits.

10          43. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay overtime wages  
11 to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees. Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees  
12 were required to work more than eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week  
13 without overtime compensation.

14          44. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide  
15 uninterrupted meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees.

16          45. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the  
17 other aggrieved employees at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

18          46. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the  
19 other aggrieved employees all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation.

20          47. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the  
21 other aggrieved employees' wages within any time permissible under California law,  
22 including, *inter alia*, California Labor Code section 204.

23          48. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide complete  
24 and accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees.

25          49. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to keep complete and  
26 accurate payroll records for Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees.

27          50. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff  
28 and the other aggrieved employees for necessary business-related expenses and costs.

1           51.     At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to properly  
2     compensate Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees pursuant to California law in order  
3     to increase Defendants' profits.

4           52.     California Labor Code section 218 states that noting in Article 1 of the Labor  
5     Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to "sue directly . . . for any wages or penalty  
6     due to him [or her] under this article."

7                                   **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

8                                   **Violation of California Labor Code § 2698, et seq.**

9     **(Against DOMA TITLE OF CALIFORNIA, INC., DOMA HOLDINGS, INC., NORTH**  
10    **AMERICAN TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY, NORTH AMERICAN SERVICES,**  
11    **LLC, STATES TITLE HOLDING, INC., and DOES 1 through 100)**

12          53.     Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1  
13     through 52, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set  
14     forth herein.

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

20          55.     Whenever the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions,  
21     boards, agencies, or employees has discretion to assess a civil penalty, a court in a civil  
22     action is authorized to exercise the same discretion, subject to the same limitations and  
23     conditions, to assess a civil penalty.

24          56.     Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are "aggrieved  
25     employees" as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current  
26     or former employees of Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations was committed  
27     against them.

28     ///

**Failure to Pay Overtime**

57. Defendants' failure to pay legally required overtime wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.

**Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

58. Defendants' failure to provide legally required meal periods to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

**Failure to Provide Rest Periods**

59. Defendants' failure to provide legally required rest periods to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes a violation of California Labor Code section 226.7.

**Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

60. Defendants' failure to pay legally required minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1.

**Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination**

61. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees upon termination in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 and 202 constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

**Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment**

62. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees during employment in accordance with Labor Code section 204 constitutes a violation of California Labor Code section 204.

**Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements**

63. Defendants' failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with Labor Code section 226(a) constitutes a violation of California Labor Code section 226(a).

**Failure to Keep Complete and Accurate Payroll Records**

64. Defendants' 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 a violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d).

**Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business-Related Expenses and Costs**

65. 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 a violation of California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.

66. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of all aggrieved employees, requests and is entitled to recover from Defendants and each of them, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.5, as well as all penalties pursuant to PAGA against Defendants, 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 aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- 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.

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

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

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act, requests a trial by jury.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000):

**As to the First Cause of Action**

1. For civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699(a), (f), (g) and 558, costs/expenses, and attorneys' fees for violation 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; and

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

DATED: May 18, 2023

**LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC**

By:   
Edwin Arwazian  
Attorneys for Plaintiff