

Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
 E-mail: kmoon@moonlawgroup.com
 Allen Feghali (SBN 301080)
 E-mail: afeghali@moonlawgroup.com
 Charlotte Mikat-Stevens (SBN 327047)
 E-mail: cmikat-stevens@moonlawgroup.com
MOON LAW GROUP, PC
 725 S. Figueroa Street, 31st Floor
 Los Angeles, California 90017
 Telephone: (213) 232-3128
 Facsimile: (213) 232-3125

Attorneys for Plaintiff Alyssa Nicole Cruz

FILED
 Superior Court of California
 County of Los Angeles

09/14/2026

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: C. Gomez Deputy

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

ALYSSA NICOLE CRUZ, individually, and on
 behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

UNITED TALENT AGENCY, LLC; and DOES
 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants

Case No.: 25STCV30710

**SECOND AMENDED CLASS AND
 REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
 COMPLAINT:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197];
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Compensation [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198];
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512];
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Breaks [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 558];
5. Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses [Cal. Lab. Code § 2802];
6. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203];
7. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements [Cal. Lab. Code § 226];
8. Unfair Business Practices [Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*];
9. Civil Penalties under PAGA [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*]; and
10. Failure to Pay Premium Pay When Employees Are Not Provided with at Least One Day of Rest in Seven Days [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 551, 552, and 558].

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.....	1
THE PARTIES	3
A. Plaintiff.....	3
B. Defendants	3
ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION	4
CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS.....	8
FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION.....	12
SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION.....	13
THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION	15
FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	15
FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	16
SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	17
SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	18
EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	19
NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION	22
TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	25
PRAYER FOR RELIEF.....	26
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL.....	31

1 Plaintiff Alyssa Nicole Cruz (“Plaintiff”), based upon facts that either have evidentiary
2 support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further
3 investigation and discovery, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants United talent Agency, LLC, and Does
6 1 through 10 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor Code violations and
7 unfair business practices stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay
8 overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure
9 to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failure to timely pay all wages to
10 terminated employees, failure to indemnify necessary business expenses, and failure to furnish
11 accurate wage statements.

12 2. Plaintiff brings the First through Eighth and Tenth Causes of Action individually
13 and as a class action on behalf of herself and certain current and former employees of Defendants
14 (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members” and defined more fully
15 below). The Class consists of Plaintiff and all other persons who have been employed by any
16 Defendants in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee during the statute of limitations
17 period applicable to the claims pleaded here.

18 3. Plaintiff brings the Ninth Cause of Action as a representative action under the
19 California Private Attorney General Act (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties that are owed to
20 Plaintiff, the State of California, and past and present hourly-paid, non-exempt employees of
21 Defendants who worked in California during the applicable statute of limitations period (hereinafter
22 referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”).

23 4. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
24 establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. As such, and based
25 upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants’ business in California, Defendants are
26 subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission
27 (“IWC”), and the California Business & Professions Code.

1 5. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period Defendants maintained
2 a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 3 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum
4 wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code
5 and IWC Wage Orders;
- 6 (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in
7 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing
8 to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and failing
9 to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period violation
10 occurred;
- 11 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
12 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
13 Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a rest
14 period violation occurred;
- 15 (d) Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred;
- 16 (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, overtime wages,
17 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages due within the
18 time period specified by California law when employment terminates;
- 19 (f) Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked;
- 20 (g) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements
21 containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and
22 IWC Wage Orders; and
- 23 (h) Failing to pay premium pay when employees are not provided with at least
24 one day of rest in seven days.

25 6. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them, were on actual and
26 constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their
27 unlawful policies. Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were
28 willful and deliberate.

7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts, and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of “respondeat superior”.

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

8. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of Los Angeles, State of California from approximately March 2024 to June 2025.

9. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v. American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

B. Defendants

10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendants are:

- (a) Business entities with their principal places of business in Los Angeles, California.
- (b) Business entities conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Los Angeles County; and
- (c) The former employers of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employers of the putative Class and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions; and
- (d) At all times mentioned herein, Defendants are and were the joint employers of Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

11. Plaintiff does not currently know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages

1 suffered by Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiff will
2 amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they
3 have been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

4 12. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and each
5 of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or
6 injured a significant number of Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in the State of
7 California.

8 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times each
9 Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff, the Class,
10 and the Aggrieved Employees, and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working
11 conditions. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, each
12 Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director, controlling
13 shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest, and/or predecessor in
14 interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other
15 Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the
16 other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below.
17 Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted pursuant to and
18 within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have
19 known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided, and abetted the
20 conduct of all other Defendants.

21 **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

22 14. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of Los
23 Angeles, State of California during the statutory period. During the statutory time period,
24 Defendants classified Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee. Plaintiff was typically scheduled to
25 work at least 5 days in a workweek, and typically in excess of 8 hours in a single workday.

26 15. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours
27 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with
28 uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take uninterrupted rest

1 periods, failed to indemnify Plaintiff for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all final
2 wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment, and failed to furnish
3 accurate wage statements to Plaintiff. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for
4 Defendants was typical and illustrative.

5 16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not
6 paying Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all
7 overtime wages. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work off-the-
8 clock, and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
9 received work-related communications via texts, telephone calls, and emails while off the clock,
10 and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes
11 interrupted during meal breaks without compensation. Also throughout the statutory period,
12 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees received nondiscretionary bonuses and other
13 remuneration. However, Defendants failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the
14 correct overtime rate of pay, meal break premium rate of pay, and sick day rate of pay, leading to
15 underpayment. Also, Defendants failed to include the amount of available and unused paid sick
16 days in the wage statements.

17 17. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to provide
18 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods.
19 Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
20 to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and
21 uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating
22 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the
23 end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not adequately inform
24 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of
25 the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work.
26 Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff, the
27 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

1 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
2 and permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest
3 periods. Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
4 Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and
5 permitting them to take a 10-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours
6 of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff, the Class, and the
7 Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendants also did
8 not adequately inform Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a
9 rest period. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or
10 authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendants
11 have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendants also did not
12 have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
13 Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendants did not maintain accurate
14 records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendants cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff, the
15 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period.
16 Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiff, the Class,
17 and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

18 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff, the
19 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their
20 duties for Defendants without reimbursement, such as the use of personal cellular telephones and
21 transportation.

22 20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
23 pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at the conclusion of their employment all
24 wages for all minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period
25 premium wages. Further, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
26 their final paychecks immediately upon termination.

27 21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff, the Class,
28 and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable

1 hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages
2 earned for hours worked, correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were
3 not provided in accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not
4 authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and Defendant's address).
5 Further, the wage statements do not show Defendant's address as required by California law. As a
6 result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
7 Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

- 8 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
9 minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest
10 period premium wages to which they were entitled, even though they were
11 entitled;
- 12 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum,
13 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even
14 though they had not been;
- 15 (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum,
16 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the
17 correct California rate, even though they were;
- 18 (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime,
19 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct
20 California rate, even though they had not been;
- 21 (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum,
22 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- 23 (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
24 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have
25 to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages
26 owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage
27 statements contained the required accurate information;

1 (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to lose
2 entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability,
3 unemployment, and other governmental benefits; and

4 (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages
5 rates to which Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were
6 entitled, and Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were paid
7 less than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

8 Thus, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for in
9 California Labor Code § 226(e), including actual damages.

10 22. Throughout the statutory period, Defendant caused Plaintiff and Aggrieved
11 Employees to occasionally work seven consecutive days in a row. However, Defendant failed to
12 pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees premium wages of one and one-half times the regular
13 rate of pay for working seven consecutive days in a workweek as required by California law.
14 Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not pay premium wages to Plaintiff, the
15 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for working seven consecutive dates in a workweek, in
16 violation of California law.

17 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

18 23. Plaintiff brings certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all other
19 persons similarly situated, and thus, seek class certification under California Code of Civil
20 Procedure § 382.

21 24. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief
22 authorized by California law.

23 25. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

24 All persons who worked for any Defendant in California as an hourly, non-
25 exempt employee at any time during the period beginning four years before the
26 filing of the initial complaint in this action and ending when notice to the Class
is sent.

27 26. At all material times, Plaintiff was a member of the Class.
28

1 27. Plaintiff undertakes this concerted activity to improve the wages and working
2 conditions of all Class Members.

3 28. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is
4 readily ascertainable:

5 (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so
6 numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical.
7 The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time,
8 however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals and the
9 identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of
10 Defendants' records.

11 (b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect
12 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-
13 defined community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any)
14 are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.

15 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect
16 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-
17 defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated
18 herein. Plaintiff has no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class
19 Member. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed Class Counsel, are versed in the
20 rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff
21 has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action will continue to
22 incur, costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily
23 expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each
24 Class Member.

25 (d) Superiority: A Class Action is superior to other available methods for the
26 fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

27 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling
28 the prosecution or defense of separate actions;

- 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by or against members of the Class;
- 3) The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in the particular forum; and
- 4) The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class action.

(e) Public Policy Considerations: The public policy of the State of California is to resolve the California Labor Code claims of many employees through a class action. Indeed, current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are also fearful of bringing actions because they believe their former employers might damage their future endeavors through negative references and/or other means. Class actions provide the class members who are not named in the complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights at the same time as their privacy is protected.

29. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class (and each subclass, if any) that predominate over questions affecting only individual members, including without limitation, whether, as alleged herein, Defendants have:

- (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum wages, and overtime wages;
- (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class Members;
- (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages to Class Members;
- (d) Failed to promptly pay all wages due to Class Members upon their discharge or resignation;
- (e) Failed to maintain accurate records of all hours Class Members worked, and all meal periods Class Members took or missed;

- (f) Failed to reimburse Class Members for all necessary business expenses;
- (g) Failed to pay premium pay when employees are not provided with at least one day of rest in seven days; and
- (h) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et. seq.*, as a result of their illegal conduct as described above.

30. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because:

- (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any question affecting only individual members;
- (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the class before the Court;
- (d) Plaintiff, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a class action;
- (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries for which Defendants are responsible in an amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the Class for the injuries sustained;
- (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Class would create a risk of:
 - 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or
 - 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual Class Members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other

1 members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially
2 impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including, but
3 not limited to, the potential for exhausting the funds available from
4 those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and

5 (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
6 the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to
7 the Class as a whole.

8 31. Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of
9 the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. Defendants' own business
10 records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated notices.
11 To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiff would contemplate the use of
12 additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as published notice, e-mail
13 notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by other methods suitable to the
14 Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

15 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Minimum Wages for All Hours Worked)**

17 32. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
18 foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint.

19 33. "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of
20 an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or
21 not required to do so.

22 34. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants knowingly failed to pay to
23 Plaintiff and the Class compensation for all hours they worked. By their failure to pay
24 compensation for each hour worked as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the provisions
25 of California Labor Code § 1194 and any additional applicable IWC Wage Orders, which require
26 such compensation to non-exempt employees.

27 35. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover minimum wages for all
28 non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

36. By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiff and the Class have been deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned by virtue of their employment with Defendants.

37. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to Plaintiff and the Class for their non-overtime hours worked without pay, Plaintiff and the Class suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to Plaintiff and the Class, but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

38. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code § 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage compensation due Plaintiff and the Class.

39. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194.2, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover liquidated damages (double damages) for Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages.

40. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, Plaintiff and the Class were entitled to be paid twice a month at rates required by law, including minimum wages. However, during all such times, Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay Plaintiff and the Class all such wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month.

41. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to seek recovery of all unpaid minimum wages, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6, and 1194(a).

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)

42. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint.

43. California Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

1 44. California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 provide that employees in California shall
2 not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional
3 compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, California
4 Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed
5 by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

6 45. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and the Class have worked more than eight
7 hours in a workday, as employees of Defendants.

8 46. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class
9 overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the maximum hours
10 permissible by law as required by California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198. Plaintiff and the Class
11 are regularly required to work overtime hours.

12 47. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional premium rate
13 compensation to Plaintiff and the Class for their overtime hours worked, Plaintiff and the Class
14 have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to
15 them but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court and which will be ascertained
16 according to proof at trial.

17 48. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code §
18 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation
19 due to Plaintiff and the Class.

20 49. Plaintiff and the Class also request recovery of overtime compensation according to
21 proof, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a), as well as
22 the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California
23 Labor Code and/or other statutes.

24 50. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all
25 wages due and payable twice a month. The applicable IWC Wage Orders also provide that every
26 employer shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime
27 wages for all overtime hours worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff
28 and the Class with all compensation due, in violation of California Labor Code § 204.

1 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)**

3 51. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
4 foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint.

5 52. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve Plaintiff
6 and the Class of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than the start of
7 Plaintiff and the Class's sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal periods no
8 later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. California Labor Code § 512 and
9 Section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders require that an employer provide unpaid meal
10 periods of at least 30 minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a violation of California Labor
11 Code § 226.7 for an employer to require any employee to work during any meal period mandated
12 under any IWC Wage Order.

13 53. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiff
14 and the Class with both meal periods as required by California law. By their failure to permit and
15 authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take all meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that
16 Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods),
17 Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable
18 IWC Wage Orders.

19 54. Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of
20 additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s),
21 plus interest thereon.

22 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods)**

24 55. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
25 foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint.

26 56. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10
27 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e., more than
28 two hours). California Labor Code § 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders require that the

1 employer permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of 10 minutes each for each
2 4-hour period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes,
3 the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is
4 itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of California Labor Code § 226.7
5 for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest period mandated under any IWC
6 Wage Order.

7 57. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiff and the
8 Class to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked more than 4 hours in a workday.
9 By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take rest periods as alleged above
10 (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted
11 rest periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 226.7 and
12 the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

13 58. Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of
14 premium wages rate for each workday he or she was not provided with all required rest break(s),
15 plus interest thereon.

16 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses)**

18 59. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
19 foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint.

20 60. Defendants violated California Labor Code § 2802 and the applicable IWC Wage
21 Orders, by failing to pay and indemnify Plaintiff and the Class for their necessary expenditures and
22 losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to
23 directions of Defendants.

24 61. As a result, Plaintiff and the Class were damaged at least in the amounts of the
25 expenses they paid, or which were deducted by Defendants from their wages.

26 62. Plaintiff and the Class she represents are entitled to attorneys' fees, expenses, and
27 costs of suit pursuant to California Labor Code § 2802(c) and interest pursuant to California Labor
28 Code § 2802(b).

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees – Waiting Time**
3 **Penalties)**

4 63. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
5 foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint.

6 64. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if
7 an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due
8 and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or
9 her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless
10 the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in
11 which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

12 65. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many
13 other members of the Class ended (i.e., was terminated by quitting or discharge), and the
14 employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and
15 continue to fail, to pay terminated Class Members, without abatement, all wages required to be
16 paid by California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-
17 two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

18 66. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and those Class Members who are no longer
19 employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within seventy-
20 two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§
21 201 and 202.

22 67. California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay
23 wages owed, in accordance with California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202, then the wages of the
24 employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or
25 until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

26 68. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally
27 accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days
28 maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

69. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6, and 1194, Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs incurred in this action.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and Compliant Wage Records)

70. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint.

71. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

72. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify the gross wages earned by Plaintiff and the Class, the failure to list the true “total hours worked by the employee,” and the failure to list the true net wages earned.

73. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

74. Specifically, Plaintiff and the members of the Class have been injured by Defendants' intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage

1 statements under California Labor Code § 226(a).

2 75. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiff and the Class is difficult and
3 time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiff and the Class were also injured as
4 a result of having to bring this action to attempt to obtain correct wage information following
5 Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the mandates of California's Labor Code and related
6 laws and regulations.

7 76. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their actual damages
8 caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a).

9 77. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief, as well as an award of
10 attorneys' fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code
11 § 226(h).

12 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **(Against all Defendants for Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200,**
14 ***et seq.*)**

15 78. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
16 foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint.

17 79. Defendants, and each of them, are "persons" as defined under California Business
18 & Professions Code § 17201.

19 80. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
20 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Class Members, and to the general public. Plaintiff seeks
21 to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of California Code of
22 Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

23 81. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and
24 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions
25 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

26 82. A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, may be
27 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as violations
28 of, among other things, the California Labor Code, are unlawful and in violation of public policy;

1 and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive, fraudulent, and unscrupulous, and thereby
2 constitute unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent business practices in violation of California Business
3 & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

4 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

5 83. Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages, and other benefits in violation of the
6 California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unfair,
7 unlawful, and/or fraudulent activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§
8 17200, *et seq.*

9 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

10 84. Defendants' failure to pay overtime compensation and other benefits in violation of
11 California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as alleged
12 above, constitutes unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent activity prohibited by California Business &
13 Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

14 **Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of All Hours Worked**

15 85. Defendants' failure to maintain accurate records of all hours worked in accordance
16 with California Labor Code § 1174.5 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above,
17 constitutes unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent activity prohibited by California Business &
18 Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

19 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

20 86. Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor
21 Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unfair,
22 unlawful, and/or fraudulent activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§
23 17200, *et seq.*

24 **Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods**

25 87. Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with
26 California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes
27 unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code
28 §§ 17200, *et seq.*

1 **Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses**

2 88. Defendants' failure to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses in
3 accordance with California Labor Code § 2802 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as alleged
4 above, constitutes unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent activity prohibited by California Business &
5 Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

6 **Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

7 89. Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements in accordance
8 with California Labor Code § 226, as alleged above, constitutes unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent
9 activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

10 **Failure to Pay Premium Pay When Employees Are Not Provided with**
11 **at Least One Day of Rest in Seven Days**

12 90. Defendants' causing Plaintiff, the putative Class, and Aggrieved Employees to work
13 seven consecutive days in a row without paying premium wages in accordance with California
14 Labor Code §§ 551 and 552 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above and below,
15 constitutes unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent activity prohibited by California Business &
16 Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

17 91. By and through their unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent business practices
18 described herein, Defendants have obtained valuable property, money, and services from Plaintiff,
19 and all persons similarly situated, and have deprived Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated,
20 of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

21 92. Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result of
22 Defendants' wrongful conduct.

23 93. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, is entitled
24 to, and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property which
25 Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiff and the Class have been deprived, by
26 means of the above-described unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and
27 the Class are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful practices of
28 Defendants in order to recover restitution.

1 94. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, is further
2 entitled to, and does, seek a declaration that the above-described business practices are unfair,
3 unlawful, and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining Defendants, and each of them, from
4 engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent business practices in
5 the future.

6 95. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, has no plain,
7 speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which Plaintiff and Class Members
8 suffered as a consequence of Defendants' unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent business practices.
9 As a result of the unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiff,
10 individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, has suffered, and will continue to
11 suffer, irreparable harm unless Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to
12 engage in said unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent business practices.

13 96. Plaintiff also alleges that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth
14 herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance, and other
15 withholdings.

16 97. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiff and
17 putative Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by
18 Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a
19 permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and Class
20 Members; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and
21 other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

22 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of** 24 **2004, Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*)**

25 98. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
26 foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint.

27 99. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the State
28 of California and the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

1 100. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action to
2 recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any
3 provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and
4 Workforce Development Agency [(“LWDA”)] or any of its departments, divisions, commissions,
5 boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered
6 through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of the employee and other current
7 or former employees against whom a violation of the same provision was committed pursuant to the
8 procedures specified in Section 2699.3.”

9 101. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor Code
10 § 2699.3. On October 18, 2025, she gave written notice by online filing to the LWDA and by certified
11 mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against
12 Plaintiff and certain current and former Aggrieved Employees, including the facts and theories to
13 support the violations. Plaintiff also paid the filing fee. Plaintiff’s PAGA case number is LWDA-
14 CM-1132717-25.

15 102. More than 65 days has elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice, but the LWDA has not
16 indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’ Labor Code violations discussed in the notice.
17 Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil action to recover penalties under California Labor Code
18 § 2699, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3, for the violations of the Labor Code described
19 in this Complaint. These penalties include, without limitation, penalties under California Labor Code
20 §§ 210, 226.3, 558, and 2699(f)(2).

21 103. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants’ violation of California Labor
22 Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity,
23 employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by California
24 Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under California Labor Code § 1174.5. Pursuant to the
25 applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the
26 employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also
27 be recorded. Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every employer shall
28 keep total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay. In addition, Plaintiff seeks

1 penalties for Defendants' violation of California Labor Code §§ 551 and 552 and the applicable IWC
2 Wage Orders by causing Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to work seven consecutive days in a
3 row without paying premium wages.

4 104. During the time period of employment for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees,
5 Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the California Labor Code and applicable IWC
6 Orders by failing to maintain accurate records showing meal periods. Defendants' failure to provide
7 and maintain records required by the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders
8 deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand, and question the
9 accuracy and frequency of meal periods. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no
10 way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic
11 enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered,
12 and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest
13 on such wages, and expenses and attorneys' fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform
14 its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial.
15 Because of Defendants' knowing failure to comply with the California Labor Code and applicable
16 IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they
17 were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

18 105. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of
19 civil penalties on behalf of herself, the State of California, and similarly Aggrieved Employees of
20 Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount to be shown
21 according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted by law.

22 106. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant
23 to California Labor Code § 2699(k)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in any action shall
24 be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Premium Pay When Employees Are Not Provided with At Least One Day of Rest in Seven Days)

108. At all times herein set forth, Labor Code § 558 provides that “an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee.”

109. During the statutory period, Defendants caused Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees to occasionally work seven consecutive days in a row. However, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees premium wages of one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for working seven consecutive days in a workweek as required by California law. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not pay premium wages to Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees for working seven consecutive dates in a workweek, in violation of California law. As a result of Defendant violating Labor Code §§ 551 and 552 and the applicable

1 Wage Order, Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their
2 statutorily protected rights.

3 110. Accordingly, Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover
4 from Defendant premium wages, including one and one-half times the regular rate of pay.
5 Additionally, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees for the civil
6 penalties provided for in Labor Code § 558, subd. (a).

7 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

8 Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated only with respect to the
9 Class and PAGA claims, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally,
10 as follows:

11 **Class Certification**

- 12 1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second, Third,
13 Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Tenth Causes of Action;
14 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class; and
15 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

16 **As to the First Cause of Action**

- 17 4. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California
18 Labor Code §§ 204 and 1194 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all
19 minimum wages due;
20 5. For general unpaid wages as may be appropriate;
21 6. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
22 such amounts were due;
23 7. For liquidated damages;
24 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
25 California Labor Code § 1194(a); and
26 9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

27 **As to the Second Cause of Action**

- 28 10. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California

1 Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all
2 overtime wages due;

3 11. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;

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

6 13. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
7 California Labor Code § 1194(a); and

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

9 As to the Third Cause of Action

10 15. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California
11 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders;

12 16. For unpaid meal period premium wages as may be appropriate;

13 17. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
14 such amounts were due;

15 18. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5,
16 and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

18 As to the Fourth Cause of Action

19 20. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California
20 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders;

21 21. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate;

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

24 23. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5,
25 and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

27 ///

28 ///

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

26. For general unpaid wages and reimbursement of business expenses as may be appropriate;

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

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

31. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 for former employees who have left Defendants' employ;

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

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

36. For penalties and actual damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);

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

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

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

40. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, failing to maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, failing to indemnify necessary business expenses, and failing to pay premium pay when employees are not provided with at least one day of rest in seven days;

41. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all Class Members and prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

42. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a result of violations of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;

43. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5;

44. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and

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

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

46. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to pay all wages owed, including minimum, straight time, regular, overtime double time, sick pay, and/or vacation pay wages, failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, failing to reimburse necessary business expenses, failing to pay final wages at termination, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to pay premium pay when employees are not provided with at least one day of rest in seven days;

1 47. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*, and all other
2 applicable California Labor Code provisions, on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and all
3 Aggrieved Employees;

4 48. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate allowed;

5 49. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California
6 Labor Code § 2699;

7 50. Injunctive and declaratory relief to the extent allowed by PAGA; and

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

9 As to the Tenth Cause of Action

10 52. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California
11 Labor Code §§ 551 and 552 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders;

12 53. For unpaid premium wages as may be appropriate;

13 54. For civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 558(a);

14 55. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
15 such amounts were due;

16 56. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5,
17 and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

19 As to All Causes of Action

20 58. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.

21
22 Dated: September 14, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

23 MOON LAW GROUP, PC

24 By:  _____

25 Kane Moon
26 Allen Feghali
27 Charlotte Mikat-Stevens
28 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

Dated: September 14, 2026

By: _____

Janet

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
3) ss
4 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

5 I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18
6 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 725 S Figueroa St., 31st Floor, Los
7 poAngeles, California 90017. On **September 14, 2026**, I served the foregoing document
8 described as:

9 **SECOND AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**

10 X by placing ___ the original X a true copy thereof enclosed in sealed envelope(s) addressed
11 as follows:

12 **MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

13 Jennifer B. Zargarof, Bar No. 204382

14 Anahi Cruz, Bar No. 324326

15 Jonathan Eden, Bar No. 364324

16 300 South Grand Avenue

17 Twenty-Second Floor

18 Los Angeles, CA 90081-3132

19 Tel: +1.213.612.2500

20 Fax: +1.213.612.2501

21 jennifer.zargarof@morganlewis.com

22 anahi.cruz@morganlewis.com

23 jonathan.eden@morganlewis.com

24 *Attorneys for Defendant UNITED TALENT AGENCY, LLC*

25 [✓] **BY E-MAIL:** I hereby certify that this document was served from Los Angeles, California,
26 by e-mail delivery on the parties listed herein at their most recent known e-mail address or
27 e-mail of record in this action.

28 X (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California
that the above is true and correct.

Executed on **September 14, 2026**, at Los Angeles, Californi

Irvin Rios

Name



Signature