

Fawn F. Bekam (SBN 307312)
fawn@abramsonlabor.com
 Jacquelyn Silva (SBN 342302)
jackie.silva@abramsonlabor.com
 Desiree Ruiz Alfaro (SBN 351819)
desiree.ruizalfaro@abramsonlabor.com
ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP
 1700 W Burbank Blvd
 Burbank, CA 91506
 Telephone: (213) 493-6300
 Facsimile: (213) 336-3704

Attorneys for Plaintiff Pierre Redmond, individually,
 and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees

FILED
 Superior Court of California
 County of Los Angeles
12/22/2025

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
 By: R. Lozano Deputy

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

PIERRE REDMOND, individually, and on
 behalf of all other aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

v.

TETRA TECH, INC.; TETRA TECH BAS,
 INC.; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 25STCV30456

*Assigned for all purposes to:
 Hon. David S. Cunningham III, Dept. 11*

**FIRST AMENDED REPRESENTATIVE
 COMPLAINT FOR ENFORCEMENT OF
 THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
 ACT OF 2004, LABOR CODE §§ 2698, ET
 SEQ.**

1 Plaintiff Pierre Redmond (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all other aggrieved
2 employees, alleges as follows:

3 INTRODUCTION

4 1. Plaintiff brings this representative class action against defendants Tetra Tech, Inc.
5 and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive (collectively, “Defendants”), on Plaintiff’s own behalf and on
6 behalf of all other non-exempt employees currently or formerly employed by Defendants in
7 California at any time from October 17, 2024 to the present (“Aggrieved Employees”).

8 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants have
9 increased their profits by violating state wage and hour laws by, among other things:

- 10 (a) failing to pay all minimum, regular, and overtime wages;
- 11 (b) failing to provide meal periods or pay meal period premiums;
- 12 (c) failing to authorize or permit rest periods or pay rest period premiums;
- 13 (d) failing to indemnify business expenditures;
- 14 (e) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
- 15 (f) failing to pay all wages due during employment and upon separation of
16 employment.

17 3. Plaintiff seeks monetary relief against Defendants on behalf of himself and all other
18 Aggrieved Employees to recover, among other things, civil penalties, attorneys’ fees, costs and
19 expenses, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174,
20 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2698, *et seq.*, 2802, and Code of California
21 Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

22 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

23 4. The penalties, and other legal and equitable relief sought by Plaintiff exceed the
24 minimal jurisdictional limits of this Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

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

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

7. Venue is proper in this court because Defendants maintain offices, have agents, employ individuals, and/or transact business in this county.

THE PARTIES

8. Plaintiff is a California resident and was employed by Defendants in Los Angeles, California as a non-exempt environmental technician from approximately April 2025 to approximately May 2025.

9. Defendants were and are subject to the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders as employers whose employees were and are engaged to work throughout this county and the State of California.

10. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names or capacities of the Defendant sued herein under the fictitious names DOES 1 through 50 but will amend the complaint and serve such fictitiously named Defendants once their names and capacities become known.

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each and all of the acts and omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable, to each Defendant acting as the agent, employee, alter ego, and/or joint venturer of, or working in concert with, each of the other co-Defendants and within the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity with legal authority to act on the others' behalf.

12. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that during the relevant time period, DOES 1 through 50 were the employers of Plaintiff and the other members of the class within the meaning of all applicable state laws and statutes. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that DOES 1 through 50 directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working conditions, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff and the other members of

///

1 the class so as to make each Defendant an employer liable under the statutory provision set forth
2 herein.

3 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that DOES 1 through 50 had
4 the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the other members of the class, to set work rules
5 and conditions governing Plaintiff and the other members of the class's employment, and to
6 supervise their daily employment activities.

7 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that DOES 1 through 50
8 exercise sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's and the other members of
9 the class's employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and the other members of the
10 class.

11 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

12 15. During the relevant time period, Defendants employed Plaintiff and Aggrieved
13 Employees as non-exempt employees throughout California at Defendants' California business
14 location(s).

15 16. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and Aggrieved
16 Employees were entitled to compensation for all hours worked. However, Defendants failed to pay
17 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees at least the minimum wage and overtime wage for all hours
18 worked due to Defendants' policy and practice of rounding Plaintiff's and Aggrieved Employees'
19 time worked. Further, Defendants required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to work on
20 workdays beyond Defendants' alternative workweek schedule without adequate overtime and
21 double time compensation. As a result, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved
22 Employees for all minimum, regular, and overtime wages in violation of the Labor Code and
23 applicable IWC Wage Order.

24 17. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and Aggrieved
25 Employees were entitled to receive 30-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for every 5
26 hours worked or payment of meal period premiums at their regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.
27 However, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with 30-minute,
28 uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for every 5 hours worked and failed to pay meal period

1 premiums at their regular rate of pay in lieu thereof in violation of the Labor Code and applicable
2 IWC Wage Order.

3 18. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and Aggrieved
4 Employees were entitled to receive 10-minute, duty-free rest periods for every 4 hours worked or
5 major fraction thereof or payment of rest period premiums at their regular rate of pay in lieu
6 thereof. However, Defendants failed to permit Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to take 10-
7 minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods for every 4 hours worked or major fraction thereof
8 and failed to pay rest period premiums at their regular rate of pay in lieu thereof in violation of the
9 Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order.

10 19. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and Aggrieved
11 Employees were entitled to indemnification of all necessary expenditures or losses incurred in
12 direct consequence of the discharge of Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees' duties. However,
13 Defendants required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to use their personal devices to download
14 mobile applications, such as the TOTAL mobile application which is used to submit workplace
15 safety observations and near-miss events in real time. Defendants failed to indemnify for these
16 necessary expenditures in violation of the Labor Code.

17 20. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and Aggrieved
18 Employees were entitled to itemized wage statements that accurately showed, *inter alia*, gross
19 wages earned, total hours worked, net wages earned, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during
20 the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate. However, due
21 to Defendants' failure to record and pay for all time worked and Defendants' failure to provide
22 meal and rest periods or meal and rest period premiums in lieu thereof, Defendants failed to provide
23 accurate itemized wage statements in violation of the Labor Code.

24 21. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and Aggrieved
25 Employees were entitled to timely payment of wages due during employment and upon separation
26 of employment. In violation of the Labor Code, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees did not receive
27 payment of all wages within the required time periods. For example, Defendants did not pay
28 Plaintiff overtime wages earned during the pay period of May 17, 2025 to May 23, 2025 until

September 12, 2025. As another example, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff regular wages earned during the pay period of April 5, 2025 to April 11, 2025 until April 25, 2025.

22. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, and Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation but willfully, knowingly, and/or intentionally failed to do so in order to increase Defendants' profits.

23. Therefore, Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking monetary and injunctive relief against Defendants on Plaintiff's own behalf and on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees to recover, among other things, attorneys' fees, civil penalties, costs, and expenses.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

ENFORCEMENT OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT

(Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*)

24. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

25. Labor Code § 2699(a) provides that notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees against whom a violation of the same code provision was committed pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.

26. Labor Code § 2699(m) provides that civil penalties recovered by aggrieved employees shall be distributed as follows: 65% to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency for enforcement of labor laws, including the administration of this part, and for education of employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities under this code, to be continuously appropriated to supplement and not supplant the funding to the agency for those purposes; and 35% to the aggrieved employees.

27. Plaintiff and all other non-exempt employees currently or formerly employed by

1 Defendants in California at any time from October 17, 2024 to the present are “Aggrieved
2 Employees” as defined in Labor Code § 2699(c).

3 28. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, violates numerous Labor Code sections,
4 including the following:

- 5 (a) Failing to pay minimum and overtime wages to Plaintiff and Aggrieved
6 Employees at the correct rate in violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 558,
7 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198;
- 8 (b) Failing to provide compliant meal periods without paying Plaintiff and
9 Aggrieved Employees meal period premiums for each day that lawful meal
10 periods were not provided in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;
- 11 (c) Failing to authorize and permit compliant rest breaks without paying
12 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees rest period premiums for each day that
13 lawful rest periods were not authorized or permitted in violation of Labor
14 Code § 226.7;
- 15 (d) Failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements in violation of Labor
16 Code § 226;
- 17 (e) Failing to timely pay all wages due during Plaintiff’s and Aggrieved
18 Employees’ employment and at the end of their employment in violation of
19 Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, and 210; and
- 20 (f) Failing to maintain accurate and complete records showing the hours worked
21 each day by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor
22 Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5.

23 29. Plaintiff personally suffered each of the Labor Code violations alleged in this
24 lawsuit within the one-year period prior to his Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) notice.

25 30. Plaintiff has exhausted the administrative requirements provided in Labor Code §
26 2699.3 as to Defendants and is therefore able to pursue a claim for penalties on Plaintiff’s own
27 behalf and on behalf of all other Aggrieved Employees under PAGA.

28 ///

31. Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 226, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2699, 2699.3, and 2699.5 for the Labor Code violations alleged herein.

32. Plaintiff is entitled to recover attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 218.5, and 2699(g)(1).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

On Plaintiff's own behalf and on behalf of all other Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. For civil penalties pursuant to PAGA;
2. For injunctive relief;
3. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit and interest, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 218.5, and 2699(g)(1); and
4. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: December 22, 2025

ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP

By: 
Fawn F. Bekam
Jacquelyn Silva
Desiree Ruiz Alfaro
Attorneys for Plaintiff Pierre Redmond