

1 Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
 E-mail: kmoon@moonlawgroup.com
 2 Allen Feghali (SBN 301080)
 E-mail: afeghali@moonlawgroup.com
 3 Jacquelyne VanEmmerik (SBN 339338)
 E-mail: jvanemmerik@moonlawgroup.com
 4 Nichelle Christopherson (SBN 349221)
 E-mail: nchristopherson@moonlawgroup.com

5 **MOON LAW GROUP, PC**
 725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 3100
 6 Los Angeles, California 90017
 Telephone: (213) 232-3128
 7 Facsimile: (213) 232-3125

8 Colette Mahon (SBN 304745)
 E-mail: cmahon@lfecr.com
 9 **LAWYERS FOR EMPLOYEE AND CONSUMER RIGHTS**
 3500 West Olive Avenue, Third Floor
 10 Burbank, CA 91505
 Telephone: (323)375-5101
 11 Facsimile: (323)306-5571

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff, *Judie-Ann R. Felix Doblain*

13 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

14 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

15 JUDIE-ANN R. FELIX DOBLAIN,
 individually, and on behalf of all others
 16 similarly situated,

17 *Plaintiff,*

18 vs.

19 CHA HOLLYWOOD MEDICAL CENTER,
 L.P.; THE GOOD LIFE MEDSTAFF, LLC;
 20 and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

21 *Defendants.*

Case No.: 25STCV34357

**FIRST 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 §§ 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];
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.*]; and
9. Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*].

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	14
FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION	15
FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION	16
SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	16
SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION	18
EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION	19
NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	22
PRAYER FOR RELIEF.....	24
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL.....	28

1 Plaintiff Judie-Ann R. Felix Doblain (“Plaintiff”), based upon facts that either have
2 evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for
3 further investigation and discovery, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

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

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

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

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

- 1 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum
2 wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code
3 and IWC Wage Orders;
- 4 (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in
5 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing to
6 maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and failing to
7 pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period violation
8 occurred;
- 9 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
10 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
11 Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a rest
12 period violation occurred;
- 13 (d) Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred;
- 14 (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, overtime wages,
15 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages due within the
16 time period specified by California law when employment terminates;
- 17 (f) Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked; and
- 18 (g) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements
19 containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and
20 IWC Wage Orders.

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

25 7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the
26 unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the
27 foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees. Further,
28

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 that worked for Defendants in the County of Los Angeles, State of California from approximately August 2025 to October 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 Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and 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 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 suffered by Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

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

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

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

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

23 15. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours
24 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with
25 uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take uninterrupted rest
26 periods, failed to indemnify Plaintiff for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all final
27 wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment, and failed to furnish
28

1 accurate wage statements to Plaintiff. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for
2 Defendants was typical and illustrative.

3 16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not
4 paying Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime
5 wages. Throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees were
6 required to work off-the-clock, and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiff, the Class, and
7 Aggrieved Employees were required to clock in upstairs, which took time to walk to, and were
8 further required to wait in line in order to clock into work and when returning from meal breaks, all
9 off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees were
10 required to pass through security prior to clocking into work, off the clock and uncompensated.
11 Also, Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees were often interrupted during meal breaks
12 without compensation. Also throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved
13 Employees received nondiscretionary bonuses, shift differentials, and other remuneration.
14 However, Defendants failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the correct overtime
15 rate of pay, meal break premium rate of pay, and sick day rate of pay, leading to underpayment.
16 Also throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to include the unused and available sick pay
17 in wage statements.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

11 22. Plaintiff brings certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all other
12 persons similarly situated, and thus, seek class certification under California Code of Civil
13 Procedure § 382.

14 23. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief
15 authorized by California law.

16 24. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

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

20 25. At all material times, Plaintiff was a member of the Class.

21 26. Plaintiff undertakes this concerted activity to improve the wages and working
22 conditions of all Class Members.

23 27. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is
24 readily ascertainable:

- 25 (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so
26 numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical.
27 The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time,
28 however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals and the

identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' records.

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

(c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein.

Plaintiff has no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class Member. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

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

- 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling 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

1 class action. Indeed, current employees are often afraid to assert their rights
2 out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are also fearful
3 of bringing actions because they believe their former employers might
4 damage their future endeavors through negative references and/or other
5 means. Class actions provide the class members who are not named in the
6 complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their
7 rights at the same time as their privacy is protected.

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

- 11 (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum
12 wages, and overtime wages;
- 13 (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class
14 Members;
- 15 (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium
16 wages to Class Members;
- 17 (d) Failed to promptly pay all wages due to Class Members upon their discharge
18 or resignation;
- 19 (e) Failed to maintain accurate records of all hours Class Members worked, and
20 all meal periods Class Members took or missed;
- 21 (f) Failed to reimburse Class Members for all necessary business expenses; and
22 (g) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et. seq.* as a result
23 of their illegal conduct as described above.

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

- 26 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any
27 question affecting only individual members;

- 1 (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
2 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- 3 (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all
4 members of the class before the Court;
- 5 (d) Plaintiff, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain
6 effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a class
7 action;
- 8 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable
9 relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate compensation for
10 the damages and injuries for which Defendants are responsible in an amount
11 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the Class for the injuries
12 sustained;
- 13 (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual
14 members of the class would create a risk of:
- 15 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
16 members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards
17 of conduct for Defendants; and/or
- 18 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would,
19 as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members
20 not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially impair or
21 impede their ability to protect their interests, including but not limited
22 to the potential for exhausting the funds available from those parties
23 who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,
- 24 (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
25 the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to
26 the class as a whole.

27 30. Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of
28 the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own

1 business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated
2 notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiff would contemplate the use
3 of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as published notice, e-mail
4 notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by other methods suitable to the
5 Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

6 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

8 31. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
9 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

10 32. “Hours worked” is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an
11 employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not
12 required to do so.

13 33. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants knowingly failed to pay to
14 Plaintiff and the Class compensation for all hours they worked. By their failure to pay
15 compensation for each hour worked as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the provisions
16 of Section 1194 of the California Labor Code, and any additional applicable Wage Orders, which
17 require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

18 34. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover minimum wages for all
19 non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

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

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

37. 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.

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

39. California Labor Code section 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.

40. 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)

41. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

42. 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)

50. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

51. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the Plaintiff and the Class of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than the start of Plaintiff and the Class' sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal periods no

1 later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Section 512 of the California Labor
2 Code, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an employer provide unpaid meal
3 periods of at least 30 minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a violation of Section 226.7 of
4 the California Labor Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any meal period
5 mandated under any Wage Order.

6 52. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiff and
7 the Class with both meal periods as required by California law. By their failure to permit and
8 authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take all meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that
9 Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods),
10 Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code and the
11 applicable Wage Orders.

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

15 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

17 54. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
18 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

19 55. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10
20 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than
21 two hours). Section 512 of the California Labor Code, the applicable Wage Orders require that the
22 employer permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of 10 minutes each for each
23 4-hour period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes,
24 the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is
25 itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of Section 226.7 of the California
26 Labor Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest period mandated
27 under any Wage Order.
28

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

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

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

58. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

59. Defendants violated Labor Code section 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, by failing to pay and indemnify the Plaintiff and the Class for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of Defendants.

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

61. Plaintiff and the class they represent are entitled to attorney's fees, expenses, and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(c) and interest pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(b).

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

62. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

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

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

13 65. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and those Class members who are no longer
14 employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within seventy-
15 two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201
16 and 202.

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

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

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

27 ///

28 ///

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

4 69. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
5 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

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

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

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

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

27 74. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiff and the Class is difficult and
28 time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiff and the Class were also injured as a

1 result of having to bring this action to attempt to obtain correct wage information following
2 Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the mandates of California's Labor Code and related
3 laws and regulations.

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

6 76. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief, as well as an award of
7 attorney's fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code
8 § 226(h).

9 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

12 77. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
13 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

14 78. Defendants, and each of them, are "persons" as defined under California Business &
15 Professions Code § 17201.

16 79. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
17 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Class members, and to the general public. Plaintiff seeks
18 to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil
19 Procedure § 1021.5.

20 80. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and
21 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions
22 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

23 81. A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be
24 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as violations
25 of, among other things, the California Labor Code, are unlawful and in violation of public policy;
26 and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive, fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby
27 constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in violation of California Business
28 & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

1 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

2 82. Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages, and other benefits in violation of the
3 California Labor Code constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business
4 & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

5 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

6 83. Defendants' failure to pay overtime compensation and other benefits in violation of
7 California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity
8 prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

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

10 84. Defendants' failure to maintain accurate records of all hours worked in accordance
11 with California Labor Code § 1174.5 and the IWC Wage Orders constitutes unlawful and/or unfair
12 activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

13 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

14 85. Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor
15 Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or
16 unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

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

18 86. Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with
19 California Labor Code § 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful
20 and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

21 **Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses**

22 87. Defendants' failure to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses in
23 accordance with California Labor Code § 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above,
24 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200,
25 *et seq.*

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

27 88. Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements in accordance with
28 California Labor Code § 226, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity

1 prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

2 89. By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described
3 herein, the Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from Plaintiff, and all
4 persons similarly situated, and have deprived Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated, of
5 valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

6 90. Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result of
7 Defendants' wrongful conduct.

8 91. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, is entitled to,
9 and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property which the
10 Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiff and the Class have been deprived, by
11 means of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and
12 the Class are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful practices of
13 Defendants in order to recover restitution.

14 92. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, are further
15 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair, unlawful
16 and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of them, from engaging
17 in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in the future.

18 93. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, have no plain,
19 speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members suffered as
20 a consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a result
21 of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiff, individually,
22 and on behalf of members of the putative Class, has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable
23 harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to engage in said
24 unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

25 94. Plaintiff also alleges that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth
26 herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other
27 withholdings.

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

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

96. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

97. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

98. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “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 pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.”

99. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3. On November 22, 2025, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and former Aggrieved Employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiff's LWDA case number is LWDA-CM-1139943-25. Sixty-five (65) days have elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice, but the Labor and Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants' Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may

1 commence a civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the
2 violations of the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not
3 limited to, penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

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

12 101. During the time period of employment for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees,
13 Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the Labor Code and IWC Orders by failing to
14 maintain accurate records showing meal periods, and accurate records showing when employees
15 begin and end each work period. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records required by
16 the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to
17 know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of
18 their hours worked stated in Defendants' records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
19 Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an
20 unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
21 Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment
22 of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel
23 Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts
24 according to proof at trial. Because of Defendants' knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code
25 and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an
26 injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments
27 paid to them.
28

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

103. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney’s fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(k)(1), which states, “Any employee who prevails in any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney’s fees and costs.”

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

Class Certification

104. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action;

105. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class; and

106. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

As to the First Cause of Action

107. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 204 and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all minimum wages due;

108. For general unpaid wages as may be appropriate;

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

110. For liquidated damages;

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

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

///

///

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

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

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

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

0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

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

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

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

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

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

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

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

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

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

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

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

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

143. 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, and failing to maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to indemnify necessary business expenses;

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

145. 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.*;

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

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

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

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

149. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, 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 indemnify necessary business expenses, failing to pay final wages at termination, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;

150. For all actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*, and all other applicable Labor Code provisions;

1 151. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California
2 Labor Code § 2699;

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

4 As to all Causes of Action

5 153. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.

6
7 Dated: February 2, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

8 MOON LAW GROUP, PC

9
10 By: 

Kane Moon
Allen Feghali
Jacquelyne VanEmmerik
Nichelle Christopherson
Attorneys for Plaintiff

11
12
13 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

14 Plaintiff demands a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury.

15
16 Dated: February 2, 2026

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

17
18 By: 

Kane Moon
Allen Feghali
Jacquelyne VanEmmerik
Nichelle Christopherson
Attorneys for Plaintiff

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 South Figueroa Street, 31st Floor
7 Los Angeles, California 90017. On February 2, 2026, I served the foregoing document described
8 as:

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

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

12 **CINDY CRONIN-YODER**
13 1300 NORTH VERMONT AVE
14 LOS ANGELES, CA 90027

15 *Agent for Service of Process for Defendant*
16 *CHA HOLLYWOOD MEDICAL CENTER, L.P.*
17 (served via Mail)

18 Andrea F. Oxman (SBN 252646)
19 Sehreen Ladak (SBN 307895)
20 Kimberly Zerega (SBN 358975)
21 **JACKSON LEWIS P.C.**
22 725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
23 Los Angeles, California 90017-5408
24 Telephone: (213) 689-0404
25 Facsimile: (213) 689-0430
26 andrea.oxman@jacksonlewis.com
27 sehreen.ladak@jacksonlewis.com
28 kimmy.zerega@jacksonlewis.com

Attorneys for Defendant
THE GOOD LIFE MEDSTAFF, LLC
(served via email)

Colette Mahon (SBN 304745)
E-mail: cmahon@lfecr.com
LAWYERS FOR EMPLOYEE AND CONSUMER RIGHTS
3500 West Olive Avenue, Third Floor
Burbank, CA 91505
Telephone: (323)375-5101
Facsimile: (323)306-5571

Co-Counsel for Plaintiff, Judie-Ann R. Felix Doblain
(served via e-Mail)

26 [✓] **BY E-MAIL:** I hereby certify that this document was served from Los Angeles, California,
27 by e-mail delivery on the parties listed herein at their most recent known e-mail address or e-
28 mail of record in this action. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission,
any electronic Message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

[✓] **U.S. MAIL:** I deposited such envelope in the mail at Los Angeles, California. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid. I am “readily familiar” with the firm’s practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this **February 2, 2026** at Los Angeles, California.

Jim Salazar

Type or Print Name

Signature