

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

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
5/15/2023 3:15 PM
Kern County Superior Court
By Marina Mercado, Deputy

Attorneys for Plaintiff DANIEL GARCIA,
on behalf of himself and current and former aggrieved employees

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

DANIEL GARCIA, on behalf of himself and
current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

LIFT ENERGY CONSTRUCTION, INC.;
LUMIO HX, INC.; and DOES 1 to 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **BCV-23-101521**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF DANIEL GARCIA'S
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff DANIEL GARCIA ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains
against Defendants LIFT ENERGY CONSTRUCTION, INC.; LUMIO HX, INC.; and DOES 1 to
100, inclusive (collectively "Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*
("PAGA") representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California, himself
and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-
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

1 hours worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure
2 to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant meal periods or pay meal period
3 premium wages; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or
4 pay rest period premium wages; failure to pay accrued and vested vacation/PTO wages; statutory
5 penalties for failure to timely produce requested employment records; statutory penalties for
6 failure to provide accurate wage statements; statutory waiting time penalties in the form of
7 continuation wages for failure to timely pay employees all wages due upon separation of
8 employment. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and
9 Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor
10 Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and
11 others aggrieved.

12 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
14 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
15 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
16 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars
17 (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
18 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
19 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
20 California, including but not limited to Kern County, at 5010 Lisa Marie Court, Bakersfield, CA
21 93313.

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

26 **III. PARTIES**

27 4. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
28 Development Agency on behalf of himself and other current and former employees subject to

1 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
2 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will
3 work for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
4 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the
5 currently named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was
6 employed by Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in San Diego from in or
7 around September 20, 2021, until on or about March 8, 2022.

8 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant LIFT
9 ENERGY CONSTRUCTION, INC. is authorized to do business within the State of California and
10 is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times
11 relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant LIFT ENERGY CONSTRUCTION,
12 INC. in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices
13 or policies. Defendant LIFT ENERGY CONSTRUCTION, INC. operates in Kern County and
14 employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Kern County, including but not limited to, at 5010
15 Lisa Marie Court, Bakersfield, CA 93313.

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

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

27 8. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100. Plaintiff
28 sues said defendants by said fictitious names, and will amend this complaint when the true names

1 and capacities are ascertained or when such facts pertaining to liability are ascertained, or as
2 permitted by law or by the Court. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously
3 named defendants is in some manner responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this
4 complaint.

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

8 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

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

13 11. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding Plaintiff sending the initial
14 PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201,
15 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, and the applicable Wage Orders.

16 12. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California
17 Labor Code:

18 13. **Failure to pay wages for all hours worked at the legal minimum wage:**
19 Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt
20 employees. In California, an employer is required to pay hourly employees for all "hours worked,"
21 which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the
22 employee is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either
23 directly or indirectly, performing services which inure to the benefit of the employer.

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

27 15. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
28 hourly non-exempt employees worked more minutes per shift than Defendants credited them with

1 having worked. Specifically, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former
2 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages at the applicable minimum
3 wage for all hours worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but
4 not limited to:

5 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
6 non-exempt employees to load vehicles prior to clocking in for their start shift and unload vehicles
7 after clocking out for their end shift;

8 (b) Automatically deducting thirty (30) minutes from Plaintiff and other current and
9 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' daily hours worked and
10 attributed that time to an unpaid meal break despite that Defendant routinely failed to provide
11 employees their meal breaks, provided meal breaks less than 30 minutes, required employees work
12 through their meal breaks, and/or interrupted employees during their meal breaks.

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

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

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

28 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40)
hours in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of

work in any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-one-half (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.

Labor Code section 510.

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

(a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to load vehicles prior to clocking in for their start shift and unload vehicles after clocking out for their end shift;

(b) Automatically deducting thirty (30) minutes from Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' daily hours worked and attributed that time to an unpaid meal break despite that Defendant routinely failed to provide employees their meal breaks, provided meal breaks less than 30 minutes, required employees work through their meal breaks, and/or interrupted employees during their meal breaks.

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

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

22. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an

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

23. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code section 226.7; Wage Order 16 at §11.

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

(a) Defendant automatically deducted thirty (30) minutes from Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees daily hours worked and attributed that time to an unpaid meal break despite that Defendant routinely failed to provide employees their meal breaks, failed to provide meal breaks of 30 minutes, required employees work through their meal breaks, and/or interrupted employees during their meal breaks;

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

(c) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a second uninterrupted duty-free meal period of no less than thirty

(30) minutes for each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

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

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

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

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

29. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer

1 must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday
2 the employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7;
3 Wage Order 16 at § 12.

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

8 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
9 hourly non-exempt employees timely, uninterrupted duty-free net ten (10) minute rest breaks for
10 every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof; and

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

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

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

24 33. **Failure to pay accrued and vested vacation wages:** Defendants had a policy
25 and/or procedure of providing its employees with paid vacation time and/or personal time off
26 ("PTO").

27 34. Vacation/PTO wages are deferred wages that vest once accrued. California Labor
28 Code § 227.3 provides that an employer must pay its employees all unused vested vacation/PTO at

1 the time of termination at the employees' final rate of pay.

2 35. Defendants had a vacation policy in which Plaintiff and other current and former
3 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees accrued vacation/PTO wages.

4 36. Defendants terminated Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
5 based hourly non-exempt employees without paying them the full amount of their earned
6 vacation/PTO wages, in violation of California law, and employed policies and procedures which
7 ensured Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
8 employees would not receive their accrued and vested vacation/PTO wages upon termination.

9 37. **Failure to produce requested employment records:** An employer must afford
10 current and former employees the right to inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to their
11 employment, upon reasonable request to the employer. Labor Code section 226(b). An employer
12 who receives a request to inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to a current or former
13 employee must comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than twenty-one (21)
14 calendar days from the date of the request. Labor Code section 226(c). Additionally, every current
15 and former employee, or his or her representative, has the right to inspect and receive a copy of the
16 personnel records that the employer maintains relating to the employee's performance or to any
17 grievance concerning the employee. Labor Code section 1198.5(a). Upon written request from a
18 current or former employee or his or her representative, an employer must make the contents of
19 those personnel records available for inspection or provide a copy of the personnel records to the
20 current or former employee, or his or her representative, not later than thirty (30) calendar days
21 from the date the employer receives the written request, subject to some limited exceptions. Labor
22 Code §1198.5(b)(1). Failure to comply with these requests allows for a civil penalty seven
23 hundred fifty dollars (\$750), pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198.5(k) and 226(f).

24 38. On October 20, 2022, Plaintiff sent a written request through his counsel to
25 Defendants for his payroll records, timecards, and personnel records pursuant to Labor Code
26 sections 226 and 1198.5. However, Defendants failed to timely produce the requested employment
27 records, in violation of Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Employer did not produce full
28 version of the requested employment records as of the date of this Complaint, in violation of

1 Labor Code section 226 and 1198.5

2 39. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that other similarly situated
3 employees also sent written requests for their employment records, but Defendants failed to timely
4 produce the required and requested records, in violation of Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5.

5 40. **Failure to timely pay earned wages during employment:** In California, wages
6 must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the
7 employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code section 204(a). Wages
8 earned between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the
9 16th and the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day,
10 inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following
11 month. *Id.* Other payroll periods such as those that are weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly, must be
12 paid within seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period in which wages were
13 earned. Labor Code section 204(d).

14 41. As a derivative of Plaintiff's claims above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed
15 to timely pay Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
16 exempt employees' earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period
17 premium wages, and/or rest period premium wages), in violation of Labor Code section 204.
18 Defendants' aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in their failure to pay
19 Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees'
20 their earned wages within the applicable time frames outlined in Labor Code section 204.

21 42. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section
22 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an
23 employee his or her wages, the employer must "furnish each of his or her employees ... an
24 itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the
25 employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is
26 exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of
27 the Industrial Welfare Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable
28 piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all

1 deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5)
2 net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the
3 name of the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal
4 entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
5 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

6 43. Defendant committed direct violations of Labor Code section 226, through their
7 policies, practices, and/or procedures, including, but not limited to:

8 (a) Failing to list rate for meal breaks premium wages; and

9 (b) Failing to accurately reflect total hours worked.

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

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

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

25 47. Defendants’ violations of Wage Order 16 constituted violations of Labor Code
26 section 1198, which prohibits employment under conditions of labor that violate the Wage Orders.

27 48. Labor Code sections 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved
28 employee, on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees, to bring a civil

1 action to recover civil penalties against all Defendants pursuant to the procedures specified in
2 Labor Code section 2699.3.

3 49. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor
4 Code section 2699.3. On March 7, 2023, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA
5 and provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific
6 provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to
7 support the violations alleged.

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

13 51. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
14 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 227.3,
15 510, 512, 1194, 1197, and beginning one (1) year preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA
16 Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the following amounts:

17 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226.7, 512, one
18 hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and
19 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent
20 violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

21 b. For violations of Labor Code section 226, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250)
22 for each employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent violation,
23 one thousand dollars (\$1000) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts
24 established by Labor Code section 226.3].

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

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

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

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

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

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

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

Dated: May 15, 2023

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

By: 

Joseph Lavi, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Courtney M. Miller, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
DANIEL GARCIA,
on behalf of himself and current and former
aggrieved employees