

Lilit Tunyan (SBN 329351)
ltunyan@tunyanlaw.com
Artur Tunyan (SBN 349174)
atunyan@tunyanlaw.com
TUNYAN LAW, APC
535 N Brand Blvd., Suite 285
Glendale, CA 91203
Telephone: (323) 410-5050

Attorneys for Plaintiff PEDRO JIMENEZ,
as an individual and on behalf of all employees similarly situated

Electronically Filed
2/4/2026 10:06 AM
Superior Court of California
County of Stanislaus
Hugh K. Swift
Clerk of the Court
By: Omar Fernandez, Deputy

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

PEDRO JIMENEZ, as an individual and on
behalf of all employees similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

1ST CHOICE ELECTRIC ENTERPRISES,
INC., a California Corporation; DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CV-25-011235

**Amended as a matter of right, pursuant to
Labor Code Section 2699.3(a)(2)(c)**

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

1. Failure to Pay All Wages and Sick Pay;
2. Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
3. Failure to Provide Rest and Recovery Periods;
4. Failure to Keep Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
5. Failure to Pay Wages Upon Termination of Employment;
6. Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Expenditures;
7. Unfair Business Practices; and
8. Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq*

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1
2 Plaintiff PEDRO JIMENEZ (hereinafter referred to as “Plaintiff”) on behalf of himself and
3 all others similarly situated, and as representative of the State of California and the Labor and
4 Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”), based upon facts that either have evidentiary
5 support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further
6 investigation and discovery, complains and alleges as follows:

7 **INTRODUCTION**

8 1. This is a class action brought on behalf of Plaintiff and the class he seeks to
9 represent (“Class” or “Class Members”). Class Members consist of all non-exempt, hourly-paid
10 employees currently and/or formerly employed by 1ST CHOICE ELECTRIC ENTERPRISES,
11 INC. in the State of California during the Class Period. The term “Class Period” is defined as
12 four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint through the date final judgment is entered.
13 Plaintiff reserves the right to amend this Complaint to reflect a different “Class Period” or “Class”
14 as further discovery is conducted.

15 2. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the class he seeks to represent, seeks relief
16 against 1ST CHOICE ELECTRIC ENTERPRISES, INC. (“Defendant”) for Defendant’s failure
17 to pay all wages due; failure to provide meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof; failure to
18 provide rest and recovery periods or compensation in lieu thereof; failure to provide accurate
19 itemized wage statements upon payment of wages; failure to reimburse for necessary
20 expenditures; failure to pay wages of terminated or resigned employees; and failure to provide
21 correct paid sick leave and provide accurate sick leave amount balance.

22 3. Plaintiff seeks equitable remedies in the form of declaratory relief and injunctive
23 relief, and relief under Business and Professions Code Section 17200 et seq. for unfair business
24 practices.

25 4. At all relevant times herein, Defendant has consistently maintained and enforced
26 against Plaintiff and Class the following unlawful practices and policies:

27 (a) willfully refusing to pay Plaintiff and Class for all hours worked;
28

- (b) willfully refusing to provide correct paid sick leave and written notice of paid sick leave;
- (b) willfully refusing to permit Plaintiff and Class from taking meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof;
- (c) willfully refusing to permit Plaintiff and Class from taking rest and recovery periods or compensation in lieu thereof;
- (d) willfully refusing to maintain accurate records and to furnish to Plaintiff and Class accurate itemized wage statements upon payment of wages;
- (e) willfully refusing to compensate Plaintiff and certain members of the Class wages due and owing at the time of Plaintiff and Class Members' employment with Defendant ended; and
- (f) willfully refusing to reimburse Plaintiff and Class for necessary expenditures.

5. On information and belief, Defendant was on actual and constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their unlawful policies. Defendant's violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were willful and deliberate.

6. At all relevant times, Defendant was and is 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 and Class. Further, Defendant is responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of "respondeat superior".

7. Plaintiff further brings this action as a representative of the State of California and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") to recover civil penalties pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"), Labor Code sections 2698, et seq., for violations of numerous Labor Code provisions, including, but not limited to, sections 201-

203, 204, 226, 226.7, 245-248.6, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2802, as well as violations of the applicable Wage Order.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. Venue is proper in this judicial district and in the County of Stanislaus, California because Defendant maintained its location and/or transacted business in this county, the obligations and liability arise in this county, and work was performed by members of the proposed class made the subject of this action in this county.

9. The wages, statutory penalties, monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, article VI, Section 10. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

10. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction in the matter because the individual claims are under the seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000.00) jurisdictional threshold for Federal Court and the five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00) aggregate jurisdictional threshold for Federal Court and, upon information and belief, Plaintiff and Defendant are residents of, domiciled in, or otherwise subject to jurisdiction in the State of California. Further, there is no federal question at issue as the issues herein are based solely on California statutes and law including the Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Orders, the Code of Civil Procedure, the Rules of Court, and the Business and Professions Code.

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

11. Plaintiff, at all relevant times herein, was Defendant's employee and was entitled to compensation for all hours worked, including regular time and overtime compensation, and penalties from Defendant. Plaintiff is employed by Defendant as a non-exempt, hourly paid employee during the Class Period. Specifically, Plaintiff works for Defendant an electrician from October 2024 to October 21, 2025 primarily in Stanislaus and Merced counties. Each of the Class

Members are identifiable, current and/or former similarly situated persons who were employed in non-exempt hourly positions in California by Defendant during the Class Period.

B. Defendant

12. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant is a California corporation. On information and belief, Defendant was and/or is the employer of Plaintiff and Class during the Class Period. Plaintiff also alleges that Defendant is conducting business in good standing in California.

13. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships and extent of participation in the conduct herein alleged of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, but on information and belief alleges that these Defendants are legally responsible for the payment of overtime compensation, rest and meal period compensation, and wages to Plaintiff and Class by virtue of their unlawful practices, and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of each DOE Defendants when ascertained.

14. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each Defendant acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendant, carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendant. Furthermore, Defendants in all respects acted as the employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and Class.

15. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each Defendant acted in all respects as the agent, servant, partner, joint venture, alter-ego, employee, proxy, managing agent, and/or principal of the Defendant, and in performing the actions mentioned below was acting, at least in part, within the course and scope of that authority as such agent, proxy, servant, partner, joint venture, employee, alter-ego, managing agent, and/or principal with permission and consent of the Defendant. Plaintiff also alleges the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendant.

16. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the Defendant sued herein was, at all times relevant hereto, the employer, owner, shareholder,

principal, joint venture, proxy, agent, employee, supervisor, representative, manager, managing agent, joint employer and/or alter-ego of the remaining Defendant, and was acting, at least in part, within the course and scope of such employment and agency, with the express and implied permission, consent, and knowledge, approval and/or ratification of the other Defendant.

17. The above Defendant, managing agents, and supervisors aided, abetted, condoned, permitted, approved, authorized and/or ratified the unlawful acts described herein.

ADMINISTRATIVE PREREQUISITE

18. On November 17, 2025, prior to filing this complaint, Plaintiff gave written notice by electronically filing the notice with the Labor Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") (LWDA Case No. LWDA-CM-1138457-25), and by certified mail to Defendant of the specified provisions alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations as required by Labor Code Section 2699.3.

19. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's letter sent to the LWDA dated November 17, 2025, is attached hereto as "**Exhibit A**". As of the filing of this complaint, LWDA has not responded to the written notice.

20. Under Labor Code Section 2699.3 subsection (a), a plaintiff may bring a cause of action under PAGA only after giving notice to the Labor Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and the employer of the Labor Code Sections alleged to have been violated, and after receiving notice from the LWDA of its intention not to investigate, or after 65 days have passed without notice.

21. More than sixty-five (65) days have passed without notice from the LWDA. Accordingly, all administrative prerequisites for filing this action have been fulfilled.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

22. Plaintiff worked for Defendant as an electrician from October 2024 to October 21, 2025.

23. Labor Code Section 1194 provides that notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, an employee receiving less than the legal overtime compensation is entitled to

1 recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of his or her overtime compensation, including interest
2 thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit.

3 24. Labor Code Section 1197 provides the California requirement that employees
4 must be paid at least the minimum wage fixed by the IWC, and any payment of less than the
5 minimum wage is unlawful. Furthermore, "in any action under Labor Code Sections 98, 1193 .6,
6 1194, or 1197.1 to recover wages because of the payment of a wage less than the minimum wage
7 fixed by an order of the commission or by statute, an employee shall be entitled to recover
8 liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon ... "
9 See California Labor Code Section 1194.2.

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

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

18 27. Labor Code Section 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages
19 two times per month on days designated in advance by the employer as regular paydays.
20 Pursuant to Labor Code Section 204 (a) labor performed between the 1st and 15th days,
21 inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the
22 month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last
23 day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the
24 following month. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 204 (d) the requirements of this Section shall
25 be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if
26 the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.
27 Plaintiff and Class were also entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all
28 meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for hours

1 worked. However, during Class period, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the
2 employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were
3 not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods
4 not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wages for all hours worked.

5 28. Further, Business and Professions Code Section 17203 provides that any person
6 who engages in unfair competition may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction.
7 Business and Professions Code Section 17204 provides that any person who has suffered actual
8 injury and has lost money or property as a result of the unfair competition may bring an action in
9 a court of competent jurisdiction.

10 29. During all, or a portion of the Class Period, Plaintiff and each member of the Class
11 was employed by Defendant in the State of California.

12 30. Plaintiff and Class Members were non-exempt employees covered under one or
13 more IWC Wage Order(s), and Labor Code Section 510, and/or other applicable Wage Orders,
14 regulations and statutes, and each Class Member was not subject to an exemption for executive,
15 administrative or professional employees, which imposed obligations on the part of Defendant to
16 pay Plaintiff and Class Members lawful overtime compensation.

17 31. Plaintiff and Class were covered by one or more IWC Wage Order(s), and Labor
18 Code Section 226.7 and other applicable Wage Orders, regulations and statutes which imposed
19 an obligation on the part of Defendant to pay Plaintiff and Class rest and meal period
20 compensation.

21 32. In *Oliver v. Konica Minolta Business Solutions U.S.A., Inc.* (2020) 51 Cal.App.5th,
22 the California Court of Appeal held that service technicians who used their personal vehicles to
23 carry supplies and tools to and from customer locations "may" be entitled to compensation for
24 their time driving from home to their first customer site in the morning and back to their home
25 from their last customer site in the afternoon/evening, as well as mileage reimbursement.

26 33. During the Class Period, Defendant was obligated to pay Plaintiff and Class
27 Members overtime compensation for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours of work in
28

one (1) day or forty (40) hours in one (1) week and double-time compensation for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) in one (1) day.

34. During the Class Period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and Class Members for all hours worked. Defendant regularly used a system of time rounding in a manner that resulted, over a period of time, in failing to compensate Plaintiff and Class Members properly for all the time they have actually worked, even though the realities of Defendant's operations are such that it is possible, practical, and feasible to count and pay for work time to the minute. Accordingly, Defendant frequently paid Plaintiff and Class Members less than all their work time. Some of this unpaid work also should have been paid at the overtime rate.

35. During the Class Period, Defendant also failed to compensate Plaintiff and Class Members for all actual time worked, failed to maintain accurate time records and falsified Plaintiff's and Class Members' time records. Plaintiff and Class Members have never been required to record their time and/or sign or verify the timesheets. Based on information and belief, Plaintiff's and Class Members' supervisors would record the scheduled rounded shift hours worked by Plaintiff and Class Members instead of them as opposed to Plaintiff and Class Members clocking in and out electronically or recording their actual time on a handwritten timesheet themselves. Plaintiff and Class Members would never see the time recorded by their supervisors or verify the hours worked by them. Based on information and belief, Plaintiff and Class Members have not been compensated for all actual time they worked, including the off-the-clock time worked by them beyond the scheduled work shift hours. Defendant refused to permit Plaintiff and Class Members to personally record their actual time, and while recording Plaintiff's and Class Members time instead of them, falsified the time records by not recording the actual time worked by Defendant depriving Plaintiff and Class Members of wages.

36. During the Class Period, Defendant also failed to compensate for all time worked by Plaintiff and Class Members by making them work off-the clock. Plaintiff and Class Members were regularly required to arrive at least thirty minutes to an hour earlier than their scheduled shift

1 start time to be able to load the materials necessary for the assigned job into their personal vehicle
2 from the container that was located outside of their jobsite location prior to the start of their shift
3 and then continue driving to the jobsite. Plaintiff and Class Members were also required to work
4 off-the-clock after the end of their shifts by driving to the same container to unload the remaining
5 materials into the same container located outside of their jobsite prior to driving back from work.
6 On information and belief, Plaintiff and Class Members were not paid for the time spent on
7 loading and unloading materials before and after the start of their shifts.

8 37. During the Class Period, Plaintiff and Class Members were also required to
9 respond to Defendant's work-related calls, text messages after the scheduled hours, off-the-clock,
10 without compensation.

11 38. During the Class Period, Defendant also failed to compensate Plaintiff and Class
12 Members for the commute time to their jobsites and back while Plaintiff and Class Members were
13 required to take the tools necessary for their work home and take them back to the jobsite next
14 day, and they were required to carry these tools in their vehicles and were prevented from using
15 the commute for their own purposes. Defendant also failed to compensate Plaintiff and Class
16 Members for the commute to the jobsites as the commute was longer than their normal commute.

17 39. During the Class Period, Plaintiff and Class Members would also work off-the-
18 clock, without compensation, during their scheduled meal periods while Defendant's supervisors
19 would record Plaintiff's and Class Members' first meal periods regardless they actually took them
20 or not. Defendant refused to permit Plaintiff and Class Members to record their actual meal period
21 time. In maintaining a practice of not paying all wages owed, Defendant failed to maintain
22 accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and Class Members worked.

23 40. During the Class Period, Defendant was obligated to provide Plaintiff and Class
24 with a work-free meal period within the first five (5) hours of a shift when the workday was
25 longer than five (5) hours. Employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all
26 duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth
27 hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free
28 meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further,

1 employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not
2 provided with all required meal period(s). Here, despite these legal requirements, Defendant
3 wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with legally compliant meal periods.
4 Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and Class Members to work in excess of five consecutive
5 hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period
6 for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and Class Members for meal
7 periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work.
8 During the Class Period, Plaintiff and Class Members would often take interrupted first meal
9 periods, regularly take late first meal periods and have never been authorized to take second meal
10 periods when worked ten hours or more per shift. While Plaintiff and Class Members were
11 scheduled to start work at 6a.m. and would regularly start working earlier than their scheduled
12 shift start time as described above, Defendant's supervisors would instruct them that they have a
13 scheduled one-hour first meal period from 11a.m. to 12p.m. making their first meal periods by
14 default taken regularly late, after the fifth hour of work. Additionally, Defendant's supervisors
15 would falsify and record Plaintiff's and Class Members' one-hour rounded first meal periods and
16 deduct one-hour of pay from Plaintiff's and Class Members' wages regardless Plaintiff and Class
17 Members actually took them, or whether the meal periods were actually one hour long or
18 uninterrupted. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to
19 Plaintiff and Class Members in compliance with California law.

20 41. Lastly, Based on information and belief, despite Defendant's failure to provide
21 lawful meal periods, Defendant implemented a policy and/or practice of rounding the start and
22 end times of Plaintiff's and Class Members' meal periods and/or automatically deducting at least
23 thirty minutes or one hour per shift for missed and/or otherwise unlawful meal periods (including
24 meal periods restricted to Defendant's premises), despite having actual and/or constructive
25 knowledge that Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive lawful meal periods. Moreover,
26 based on information and belief, Defendant failed to keep accurate records of the true start and
27 end times of Plaintiff's and Class Members' meal periods. Based on information and belief, to
28 the extent meal period were recorded, Defendant illegally rounded the start and end times of

1 purported meal periods resulting in Plaintiff and Class Members not being paid for all time
2 worked as well as late and/or shortened meal periods. See *Donohue v. AMN Services, LLC*
3 (2021) 11 Cal.5th 58.

4 42. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to
5 Plaintiff and Class Members in compliance with California law.

6 43. Furthermore, Defendant failed and/or refused to pay Plaintiff and Class Members
7 one (1) hour's pay at the employees' regular rate of pay as premium compensation for
8 Defendant's failure to provide lawful thirty (30) minute, off-duty meal periods and failure to
9 provide lawful ten (10) minute rest periods within the statutory time frames.

10 44. Additionally, Defendant was obligated to provide Plaintiff and Class Members
11 with a ten (10) minute rest break for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof, worked each
12 day. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and Class Members to work in excess of four
13 consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10 minute,
14 continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four
15 hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and Class Members for rest periods that were not
16 authorized or permitted. Defendant, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff
17 and Class Members to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendant did not adequately
18 inform Plaintiff and Class Members of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendant did
19 not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiffs and
20 Class Members, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of
21 rest periods. Defendant did not have a policy and did schedule rest periods every 4 hours or a
22 major fraction. Plaintiffs and Class Members have never been authorized and taken their first,
23 second and third rest periods. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiffs and
24 Class Members to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest
25 periods. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiff and Class Members to not
26 provide compliant rest breaks for every four hours or major fraction and to not authorize or permit
27 them to take compliant rest periods.

1 45. Plaintiff and Class Members are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional
2 wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest
3 period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members the additional
4 wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted
5 to take.

6 46. California Labor Code Section 2802 requires employers to reimburse employees
7 for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of
8 their duties or of their obedience to directions of the employer.

9 47. During the Class Period, Defendant failed to indemnify Plaintiff and Class
10 Members all necessary expenditures incurred in direct discharge of their duties. Defendant
11 wrongfully required Plaintiff and Class Members to pay expenses that they incurred in direct
12 discharge of their duties for Defendant without reimbursement. Defendant required Plaintiff and
13 Class Members to purchase tools including but not limited to batteries, extensions, tool belts,
14 hammers, screw drivers, and tape measurers necessary to perform their work but failed to
15 reimburse for those tools. Plaintiff and Class Members would purchase, keep and transport those
16 tools to their jobsites in their personal vehicles. Additionally, during the Class Period, while
17 Defendant required Plaintiff and Class Members to use their personal cell phones to send pictures
18 of the progress of work and send and receive other work-related texts and calls from supervisors
19 and coworkers, Plaintiff failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for a reasonable portion
20 of their personal cell phone bills. Additionally, during the Class Period, Defendant failed to
21 reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for the mileage when they used their personal vehicles to
22 drive to the jobsites as Plaintiff and Class Members were required to take the tools necessary for
23 their work home and take them back to the jobsite next day and the usual commute to the jobsite
24 was more than 50 miles away. While Defendant initially provided \$100 allowance for some time
25 period as a mileage reimbursement to Plaintiff, Defendant stopped providing that allowance and
26 terminated Plaintiff's employment when Plaintiff raised a concern about discontinuing the travel
27 allowance. Plaintiff and Class incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing
28

1 their job duties for Defendant, and Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiff and Class for these
2 employment-related expenses.

3 48. Defendant continues to employ non-exempt, hourly-paid employees within
4 California.

5 49. Plaintiff and Class Members primarily performed non-exempt work, often in
6 excess of the maximum regular rate hours set forth in the applicable IWC Wage Order(s),
7 regulations or statutes, and therefore entitled the Plaintiff and Class Members to overtime
8 compensation at the rate of one and a half times their regular rate of pay and, when applicable,
9 double time compensation as set forth by the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), regulations and/or
10 statutes.

11 50. During the Class Period, Defendant required Plaintiff and Class Members to work
12 regular hours, off the clock hours, and overtime hours without lawful compensation in violation
13 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), regulations and statutes, and Defendant: (1) willfully failed
14 and refused, and continue to fail and refuse to pay compensation for all hours worked, including
15 lawful regular time and overtime compensation, to Class Members; and (2) willfully failed and
16 refused, and continue to fail and refuse to pay due and owing wages promptly upon termination
17 of employment to Plaintiff and affected Class Members.

18 51. Class Members who ended their employment with Defendant during the Class
19 Period but were not paid the above due compensation for all hours worked timely upon the
20 termination of their employment as required by Labor Code Sections 201, 202, and 203 are
21 entitled to penalties as provided by Labor Code Section 203.

22 52. Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were
23 entitled to timely payment of all wages earned upon termination. Plaintiff and Class Members
24 did not receive payment of all wages, including but not limited to meal and rest break premiums,
25 in violation of the Labor Code.

26 53. During the Class Period, Defendant failed to furnish Plaintiff and Class with
27 accurate, itemized wage statements showing all gross and net wages earned, including correct
28 hours worked, correct wages earned for hours worked, correct overtime hours worked, correct

1 wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, correct wages
2 for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California
3 law. As a result of these violations of California Labor Code Section 226(a), Plaintiff and Class
4 suffered injury. Thus, Plaintiff and Class are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor
5 Code Section 226(e), including actual damages.

6 54. Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Class members were
7 entitled to receive accurate wage statements, which would include meal break premiums, and/or
8 rest break premiums, as required by Labor Code Section 226.

9 55. During Class Period, Defendant failed to provide correct paid sick leave to
10 Plaintiff and Class Members. Defendant improperly calculated the sick leave accrual and the sick
11 leave rate of pay owed to Plaintiff and Class Members by failing to base the accrued sick leave
12 hours on the correct number of hours worked (as a result of the rounding/automatic deduction
13 policies and practices for meal periods and/or shift start and end times/other required off-the-
14 clock work including but not limited to work completed during unpaid meal periods and by failing
15 to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not
16 limited to, non-discretionary bonuses and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the sick
17 leave pay rate calculation). Labor Code Section 246 (i) requires employers to provide an
18 employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available. Upon
19 information and belief, Defendant failed and continue to fail to comply with Labor Code Section
20 246, by failing to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with the correct amount of paid sick leave
21 available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, at the time it pays
22 wages. Based on information and belief, Defendant failed to maintain accurate records of used
23 sick leave and the balance of paid sick leave left to Class Members throughout the relevant time
24 period. Based on information and belief, throughout the relevant period, Defendant failed to
25 provide correct notice of sick leave amount balance left for Plaintiff and Class Members, thus
26 affecting their intelligent exercise of their paid sick leave. But for this failure, Plaintiff and Class
27 Members would have used their paid sick leave at least prior to their respective separations, for
28

as on several occasions thereafter, he or she would have been entitled to use the banked sick leave and earn appropriate compensation. This illegal retention of paid sick leave is unlawful, and Plaintiff seeks all forms of injunctive relief, restitution, and declaratory relief as permitted by California law, on behalf of Plaintiff and Class Members. In violation of Labor Code Section 247.5, Defendant failed to maintain accurate records documenting the hours worked and paid sick days accrued and used by Plaintiff and Class Members, permitting the presumption that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to the maximum number of hours accruable under this article. Accordingly, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to injunctive relief, attorney's fees, declaratory relief, restitution, and penalties as permitted by law. Plaintiff requests all relief pursuant to the aforementioned code provisions, including but not limited to Labor Code Sections 233 and 234, which incorporates the paid sick leave requirements.

56. Together, Labor Code Sections 1198 and 1199 make unlawful any employment of any employee under conditions of labor prohibited by the Wage Orders, and any violation, refusal, or neglect to comply with any provision within Part 4, Chapter 1 of the Labor Code, including Sections 1174, 1197, and 1198, or order or ruling of the commission. Therefore, Defendant's violations, including but not limited to, with respect to meal periods, rest periods, recordkeeping provisions, minimum wages and overtime wages, business expenses and other violations described herein result in separate violations of Sections 1198 and 1199, which subject Defendant to civil penalties under Labor Code Sections 1197.1 and 2699.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

57. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated persons as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 382. The Class is composed of and defined as follows:

- (a) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the State of California, and who, within the four (4) years of the filing of this Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and were not paid all wages owed, including but not limited to the legally requisite minimum wage, regular time rate, overtime rate and/or double-time rate as well as were

1 not provided an accurate paid sick leave and written notice of accurate accrued
2 paid sick leave as specifically described herein;

3 (b) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the
4 State of California, and who, within the four (4) years of the filing of this
5 Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and have not
6 been provided a meal period for shifts in excess of five (5) hours within the
7 first five (5) hours such shifts, and were not provided one (1) hour's pay for
8 each day during which a lawful meal period was not provided;

9 (c) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the
10 State of California, and who, within the four (4) years of the filing of this
11 Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and have not
12 been provided a rest period for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof,
13 worked per day, and additional cool down recovery periods and were not
14 provided compensation of one (1) hour's pay for each day on which such rest
15 period(s) was not provided;

16 (d) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the
17 State of California, and who, within the four (4) years of the filing of this
18 Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and have not
19 been reimbursed expenditures in discharge of their duties;

20 (e) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the
21 State of California, and who, within the three (3) years of the filing of this
22 Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and have
23 been terminated or resigned, and have not been paid wages pursuant to Labor
24 Code Section 203 and are owed restitution and waiting time penalties for
25 unpaid wages;

26 (f) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the
27 State of California, and who, within the one (1) year of the filing of this
28 Complaint to the present have worked as non-exempt employees and were not

provided an accurate payroll record or wage statement as required under Labor Code Sections 226 and 1174;

(g) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the State of California, and who, within the four (4) years of the filing of this Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and were subjected to unlawful and unfair business practices within the meaning of California's Unfair Competition Law and who suffered injury, including lost money, as a result of Defendant's unlawful and unfair business practices.

58. Throughout discovery in this litigation, Plaintiff may find it appropriate and/or necessary to amend the definition of the Class. Plaintiff will formally define and designate a class definition at such time when Plaintiff seeks to certify the Class alleged in this Complaint.

59. This action has been brought and may be maintained as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 because there is a well-defined common interest of many persons and it is impractical to bring them all before the court.

60. The Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 because:

- (a) The questions of law and fact common to Class predominate over any question affecting only individual class members;
- (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the Class members;
- (c) Class is so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the Class before the Court;
- (d) Plaintiff and Class Members 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 common law and statutory violations and other improprieties and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries which Defendant's actions have inflicted upon Class;

- 1 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets and
2 available insurance of the Defendant are sufficient to adequately
3 compensate Class Members for the injuries sustained;
- 4 (g) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by
5 individual members of the Class would create a risk of:
- 6 (1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
7 members of the Class which would establish an incompatible
8 standard of conduct for Defendant; and/or
- 9 (2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which
10 would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other
11 members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially
12 impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including
13 but not limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available
14 from those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendant; and
- 15 (h) Defendant have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
16 Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to
17 Class as a whole.

18 61. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and Class is
19 readily ascertainable:

- 20 (a) Numerosity: The members of Class (and each subclass, if any) are so
21 numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical.
22 The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time,
23 however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 50 individuals and the
24 identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of
25 Defendant's records.
- 26 (b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the
27 interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined
28

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 class action. Indeed, current employees are often afraid to assert their rights

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

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

14 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **Failure to Pay All Wages for All Hours Worked and Provide Correct Paid Sick Leave and**
16 **Written Notice of Accrued Sick Leave**
17 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

18 63. Plaintiff and Class Members re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding
19 paragraphs of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

20 64. Labor Code Section 510, subdivision (a) states in pertinent part: "Any work in
21 excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek...
22 shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for
23 any employee."

24 65. Labor Code Section 1194, subdivision (a) states: "Notwithstanding any agreement
25 to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal
26 overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the
27
28

1 unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including
2 interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit.”

3 66. Further, pursuant to Labor Code Section 1197, payment of less than the minimum
4 wage fixed by the Labor Commission is unlawful.

5 67. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 1198, it is unlawful to employ persons for longer
6 than the hours set by the Industrial Welfare Commission or under conditions prohibited by the
7 IWC Wage Order(s).

8 68. Pursuant to the IWC Wage Order(s), Defendant is required to pay Plaintiff and
9 Class Members for all hours worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to
10 the control of an employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work,
11 whether or not required to do so.

12 69. Labor Code Section 510 provides that employees in California shall not be
13 employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless
14 they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.
15 Plaintiff and Class Members were required to work overtime in excess of eight (8) hours per
16 workday and in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek, but were not paid overtime pay.

17 70. Labor Code Section 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages
18 two times per month on days designated in advance by the employer as regular paydays.
19 Pursuant to Labor Code Section 204 (a) labor performed between the 1st and 15th days,
20 inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the
21 month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last
22 day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the
23 following month. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 204 (d) the requirements of this Section shall
24 be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if
25 the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.
26 Plaintiff and Class were also entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all
27 meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for hours
28 worked. However, during Class period, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the

1 employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were
2 not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods
3 not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wages for all hours worked.

4 71. During Class Period, Defendant failed to provide correct paid sick leave to
5 Plaintiff and Class Members. Defendant improperly calculated the sick leave accrual and the sick
6 leave rate of pay owed to Plaintiff and Class Members by failing to base the accrued sick leave
7 hours on the correct number of hours worked (as a result of the rounding/automatic deduction
8 policies and practices for meal periods and/or shift start and end times/other required off-the-
9 clock work including but not limited to work completed during unpaid meal periods and by
10 failing to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration, including
11 but not limited to, non-discretionary bonuses and/or other non-discretionary compensation into
12 the sick leave pay rate calculation). Labor Code Section 246 (i) requires employers to provide an
13 employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available. Upon
14 information and belief, Defendant failed and continue to fail to comply with Labor Code Section
15 246, by failing to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with the correct amount of paid sick leave
16 available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, at the time it pays
17 wages. Based on information and belief, Defendant failed to maintain accurate records of used
18 sick leave and the balance of paid sick leave left to Class Members throughout the relevant time
19 period. Based on information and belief, throughout the relevant period, Defendant failed to
20 provide correct notice of sick leave amount balance left for Plaintiff and Class Members, thus
21 affecting their intelligent exercise of their paid sick leave. But for this failure, Plaintiff and Class
22 Members would have used their paid sick leave at least prior to their respective separations, for
23 as on several occasions thereafter, he or she would have been entitled to use the banked sick
24 leave and earn appropriate compensation. This illegal retention of paid sick leave is unlawful,
25 and Plaintiff seeks all forms of injunctive relief, restitution, and declaratory relief as permitted by
26 California law, on behalf of Plaintiff and Class Members. In violation of Labor Code Section
27 247.5, Defendant failed to maintain accurate records documenting the hours worked and paid
28 sick days accrued and used by Plaintiff and Class Members, permitting the presumption that

1 Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to the maximum number of hours accruable under this
2 article. Accordingly, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to injunctive relief, attorney's fees,
3 declaratory relief, restitution, and penalties as permitted by law. Plaintiff requests all relief
4 pursuant to the aforementioned code provisions, including but not limited to Labor Code
5 Sections 233 and 234, which incorporates the paid sick leave requirements.

6 72. Defendant's pattern, practice and uniform administration of corporate policy
7 regarding illegal employee compensation as described herein is unlawful and creates an
8 entitlement, pursuant to Labor Code Section 218, to recovery by Plaintiff and the members of the
9 Class, in a civil action, of the unpaid balance of the full amount of wages owing, calculated at the
10 appropriate rate.

11 73. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194.2(a) (which provides that in any action under
12 Labor Code Section 1194, an employee shall be entitled to recover liquidated damages), the
13 members of Class seek recovery of liquidated damages on the straight-time portion of
14 uncompensated hours of work (not including the overtime portion thereof) in an amount equal to
15 the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

16 74. That calculation of individual damages for Class Members may at some point be
17 required does not foreclose the possibility of taking common evidence on questions regarding
18 their entitlement to overtime compensation. *Collins v. Rocha* (1972) 7 Cal.3d 232; *Hypolite v.*
19 *Carleson* (1975) 52 Cal.App.3d 566; *Employment Development Dept. v. Superior Court* (1981)
20 30 Cal.3d 256).

21 75. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 218.6 and 1194(a) and Civil Code Section 3287,
22 Class Members seek recovery of pre-judgment interest on all amounts recovered herein.

23 76. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 218.5 and/or 1194, Class Members request that
24 the Court award reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred by them in this action.

25 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods or Compensation in Lieu Thereof**

27 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

1 77. Plaintiff and Class Members re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding
2 paragraphs of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

3 78. Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512 provide that no employer shall employ any
4 person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without providing a meal period of not less
5 than thirty (30) minutes within the fifth (5th) hour of work, or employ any person for a work
6 period of more than ten (10) hours without a second (2nd) meal period of not less than thirty (30)
7 minutes.

8 79. Labor Code Section 226.7 provides that if an employer fails to provide an
9 employee a meal period in accordance with this Section, the employer shall pay the employee one
10 (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal
11 period is not provided in accordance with this Section.

12 80. Defendant failed to schedule Plaintiff and Class Members in a manner as to
13 reasonably ensure that Plaintiff and Class Members could take such meal periods within the
14 statutory timeframe. As a result, Plaintiff and Class were often forced to forego their meal
15 periods, work during their meal periods and/or take meal periods after the fifth (5th) hour of their
16 shifts. In so doing, Defendant has intentionally and improperly denied meal periods to Plaintiff
17 and Class Members in violation of Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512, and other regulations and
18 statutes.

19 81. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and Class have worked more than five (5)
20 hours in a workday.

21 82. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant failed to schedule Plaintiff and Class
22 Members in a manner so as to reasonably provide work-free meal periods in accordance with
23 Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512 and failed to record meal periods.

24 83. By virtue of Defendant's failure to schedule Plaintiff and Class Members in such
25 a way as to provide a timely and/or work free meal period to Plaintiff and Class Members, Plaintiff
26 and Class Members have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in an amount which is
27 presently unknown, but which exceed the jurisdictional limits of this Court and which will be
28 ascertained according to proof at trial.

1 84. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of Class Members, requests recovery of meal
2 period compensation pursuant to Labor Code Section 226.7 for the four (4) years prior to filing
3 this complaint, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendant in a sum as
4 provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes.

5 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **Failure to Provide Rest Periods or Compensation in Lieu Thereof**

7 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

8 85. Plaintiff and Class Members re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding
9 paragraphs of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

10 86. The IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code Section 226.7 provides that employers
11 must authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods at the rate of ten (10) minutes rest
12 time per four (4) work hours or major fraction thereof.

13 87. Labor Code Section 226.7, subdivision (b) provides that if an employer fails to
14 provide an employee rest period in accordance with this Section, the employer shall pay the
15 employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday
16 that the rest period is not provided.

17 88. During the Class Period, Defendant did not provide Plaintiff and Class Members
18 with a ten-minute rest period for every four (4) work hours or major fraction thereof. Therefore,
19 Plaintiff and Class Members were not provided lawful rest periods.

20 89. Defendant failed and/or refused to implement a policy by which Plaintiff and Class
21 Members could receive rest periods and/or work free rest periods. By and through its actions,
22 Defendant intentionally and improperly denied rest periods to Plaintiff and Class Members in
23 violation of Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512.

24 90. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and Class have worked more than four (4)
25 hours in a workday.

26 91. By virtue of the Defendant's unlawful failure to provide rest periods to Plaintiff
27 and Class Members, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered, and will continue to suffer,
28

1 damages, in amounts which are presently unknown, but which exceed the jurisdictional limits of
2 this Court and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

3 92. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of employees similarly situated, requests
4 recovery of rest period compensation pursuant to Labor Code Section 226.7 for the four (4) years
5 prior to filing this Complaint, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against
6 Defendant, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code and/or any other statute.

7 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

9 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

10 93. Plaintiff and Class re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs
11 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

12 94. Labor Code Section 1174, subdivision (d) requires an employer to keep at a central
13 location in California, or at the plant or establishment at which the employee is employed, payroll
14 records showing the hours worked daily by, and the wages paid to, each employee.

15 95. Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all
16 meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and Class Members. During the Class Period, Defendant
17 failed to maintain accurate time records and falsified Plaintiff's and Class Members' time records.
18 Plaintiff and Class Members were never required to record their time and/or sign or verify the
19 timesheets. Plaintiff believes Plaintiff's and Class Members supervisors would complete the
20 timesheets with hours worked by Plaintiff and Class Members as opposed to Plaintiff and Class
21 Members clocking in and out electronically or recording their actual time on a handwritten
22 timesheet. Plaintiff and Class Members would never see the timesheets completed by their
23 supervisors or verify the hours worked by them. Defendant refused to permit Plaintiff and Class
24 Members to personally record their actual time, and while recording Plaintiff's and Class
25 Members time falsified the time records.

26 96. Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code
27 IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and Class Members the ability to know, understand and
28 question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked

1 stated in Defendant' records. Therefore, Plaintiff and Class Members had no way to dispute the
2 resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to
3 Defendant. As a direct result, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered and continue to suffer,
4 substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and
5 expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under
6 state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of
7 Defendant' knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders,
8 Plaintiff and Class Members have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from
9 knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

10 97. Labor Code Section 226, subdivision (a) requires an employer to provide
11 employees—either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's
12 wages, or separately when wages are paid by personal check or cash—an accurate itemized wage
13 statement in writing showing

14 (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee . . . , (4) all
15 deductions . . . , (5) net wages, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which
16 the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four
17 digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification
18 number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the
19 legal entity that is the employer . . . , and (9) all applicable hourly rates in
20 effect during the pay period and corresponding number of hours worked at
21 each hourly rate by the employee

22 98. Moreover, the IWC Wage Orders require that every employer shall keep accurate
23 information with respect to each employee, including time records showing when each employee
24 begins and ends each work period, the total daily hours worked by each employee and the total
25 hours worked in each payroll period, and applicable rates of pay.

26 99. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant willfully and intentionally failed
27 to make and/or keep records which accurately reflect the hours worked by Plaintiff and Class.
28 Specifically, Plaintiff believes that Defendant's records do not accurately reflect when Plaintiff

1 and Class worked during their meal and rest periods and/or took untimely meal periods or worked
2 for hours not paid.

3 100. Labor Code Section 226, subdivision (e) provides that if an employer knowingly
4 and intentionally fails to provide a statement itemizing, inter alia, the gross and net wages earned,
5 the total hours worked by the employee and the applicable hourly overtime rates, causing the
6 employee injury, then the employee is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or
7 fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial violation and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each
8 subsequent violation, up to four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00). Plaintiff is informed and believes
9 that Defendant willfully failed to make or keep accurate records for Plaintiff and Class.

10 101. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant's failure to keep accurate payroll
11 records, as described above, violated Labor Code Section 1174, subdivision (d) and Section 226,
12 subdivision (a), and the applicable IWC Wage Order(s). Pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699,
13 subdivision (f)(2), Plaintiff and Class are entitled to penalties of \$100.00 and for the initial
14 violation and \$200.00 for each subsequent violation for every pay period during which these
15 records and information were not kept by Defendant.

16 102. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant's failure to keep and maintain
17 accurate records and information, as described above, was willful, and Plaintiff and Class are
18 entitled to statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code Section 1174.5.

19 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **Failure to Pay Wages upon Termination of Employment**

21 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

22 103. Plaintiff and Class re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs
23 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

24 104. Certain Class Members who ended their employment with Defendant during the
25 Class Period, were entitled to be promptly paid for all hours worked, including lawful regular
26 time compensation, overtime compensation, double-time compensation, and other premiums, as
27 required by Labor Code Sections 201 through 203. Plaintiff is also entitled to meal period and
28 rest period premium pay in accordance with Labor Code Sections 226 and 226.7.

105. Plaintiff and Class were not compensated for their unlawful and/or missed meal periods and/or rest periods, and were not paid proper regular time compensation, overtime compensation or double-time compensation in accordance with law as a result of Defendant's illegal rounding practice.

106. To date, Class Members who ended their employment with Defendant during the Class Period have not been compensated for all hours worked.

107. Plaintiff and the affected Class Members seek payment of penalties pursuant to Labor Code Section 203, according to proof.

108. Plaintiff is also entitled to attorneys' fees and costs, pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194, and prejudgment interest.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Business Expenditures

(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)

109. Plaintiff and Class re-allege and incorporate by reference all the above paragraphs of this complaint as if fully alleged herein.

110. California Labor Code Section 2802, states "An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties."

111. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order Section 9(B), when tools or equipment are required by the employer or are necessary to the performance of a job, such tools and equipment shall be provided and maintained by the employer, except that an employee whose wages are at least two times the minimum wage provided herein may be required to provide and maintain hand tools and equipment customarily required by the trade or craft.

112. Plaintiff and Class were not reimbursed by Defendant for necessary expenditures as a direct consequence of the discharge of their duties. Plaintiff and Class incurred expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, and Defendant have failed to indemnify Plaintiff and Class for these employment-related expenses.

113. Defendant knowingly, willingly and intentionally attempted to offset the cost of

1 doing business on the Plaintiff and Class.

2 114. Defendant had a corporate practice and policy of requiring Plaintiff and Class to
3 shoulder the burden of Defendant's cost of doing business by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and
4 Class for necessary expenditures.

5 115. Accordingly, Plaintiff and Class are entitled to an award of “necessary
6 expenditures or losses” shall include all reasonable costs, including, but not limited to, attorney’s
7 fees and interest.

8 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **Unfair Business Practices**

10 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

11 116. Plaintiff and Class re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs
12 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

13 117. Business and Professions Code Section 17200 et seq. (also referred to herein as
14 the “Unfair Business Practices Act” or “Unfair Competition Law”) prohibits unfair competition
15 in the form of any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice.

16 118. Business and Professions Code Section 17204 allows “a person who has suffered
17 injury in fact and has lost money or property as a result of the unfair competition” to prosecute a
18 civil action for violation of the Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”).

19 119. Labor Code Section 90.5, subdivision (a) states that it is the public policy of
20 California to vigorously enforce minimum labor standards in order to ensure employees are not
21 required to work under substandard and unlawful conditions, and to protect employers who
22 comply with the law from those who attempt to gain competitive advantage at the expense of their
23 workers by failing to comply with minimum labor standards.

24 120. Beginning at an exact date unknown to Plaintiff, but at least since the date four (4)
25 years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, Defendant has committed acts of unfair competition as
26 defined by the Unfair Business Practices Act, by engaging in the unlawful, unfair and fraudulent
27 business practices and acts described in this Complaint including but not limited to violations of
28

1 Labor Code Sections 201-203, 204, 226, 226.7, 245-248.6, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
2 1198, 1199, 2802, 2699(f)(2) as well as other statutes.

3 121. The violations of these laws and regulations, as well as of the fundamental
4 California public policies protecting workers, serve as unlawful predicate acts and practices for
5 purposes of Business and Professions Code Section 17200 et seq.

6 122. The acts and practices described above constitute unfair, unlawful and fraudulent
7 business practices, and unfair competition, within the meaning of Business and Professions Code
8 Section 17200 et seq. Among other things, the acts and practices have forced Plaintiff and other
9 similarly situated employees to labor for many consecutive hours without receiving the meal and
10 rest periods and overtime compensation to which they are entitled by law, while enabling
11 Defendant to gain an unfair competitive advantage over law-abiding employers and competitors.

12 123. As a result of Defendant's acts, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered injury
13 in fact in being denied their statutorily entitled meal and rest periods and full compensation for
14 hours worked.

15 124. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned acts and practices, Plaintiff
16 and Class have suffered lost wages in an amount to be proven at trial.

17 125. Business and Professions Code Section 17203 provides that a court may make
18 such orders or judgments as may be necessary to prevent the use or employment by any person
19 of any practice which constitutes unfair competition. Injunctive relief is necessary and
20 appropriate to prevent Defendant from repeating its unlawful, unfair and fraudulent business acts
21 and business practices alleged above.

22 126. Business and Professions Code Section 17203 provides that the Court may restore
23 to any person in interest any money or property that may have been acquired by means of such
24 unfair competition. Plaintiff and Class are entitled to restitution pursuant to Business and
25 Professions Code Section 17203 for all wages and payments unlawfully withheld from
26 employees, including the fair value of the meal and rest periods taken away from them during the
27 four-year period prior to the filing of this Complaint, as well as for all expenses or losses incurred
28

1 by Plaintiff and Class in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her
2 obedience to the directions of the employer.

3 127. Business and Professions Code Section 17202 provides, “Notwithstanding Section
4 3369 of the Civil Code, specific or preventative relief may be granted to enforce a penalty,
5 forfeiture, or penal law in a case of unfair competition.” Plaintiff and Class are entitled to enforce
6 all applicable penalty provisions of the Labor Code pursuant to Business and Professions Code
7 Section 17202.

8 128. Plaintiff’s success in this action will enforce important rights affecting public
9 interest, and in that regard, Plaintiff sues on behalf of the general public, as well as herself and
10 other similarly situated employees. Plaintiff and Class seek and are entitled to restitution, civil
11 penalties, declaratory and injunctive relief, and all other equitable remedies owing them.

12 129. Plaintiff herein takes upon herself enforcement of these laws and lawful claims.
13 There is a financial burden involved in pursuing this action. The action is seeking to vindicate a
14 public right, and it would be against the interests of justice to penalize Plaintiff by forcing her to
15 pay attorneys’ fees from the recovery in this action. Attorneys’ fees are appropriate pursuant to
16 Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5 and otherwise.

17 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **Violation of California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.***
19 **(Against Defendants, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

20 130. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs in this
21 complaint, as if fully alleged herein.

22 131. Plaintiff seeks recovery of penalties under the Labor Code Private Attorney
23 General Act of 2004 (“PAGA.”) (Labor Code sections 2698 *et seq.*)

24 132. PAGA permits an “aggrieved employee” to recover penalties on behalf of
25 himself/herself and other employees subject to violations of the Labor Code, including violations
26 of sections 201-203, 204, 226, 226.7, 245-248.6, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
27 1198, 1199, 2802, as well as the applicable Wage Order.

28 133. Plaintiff is informed and believes Defendants at all relevant times employed one

1 or more employees.

2 134. For those code sections that provide for the recovery of civil penalties, Plaintiff
3 will seek on behalf of all aggrieved employees those penalties. For those sections of the Labor
4 Code that do not specifically provide for civil penalties, Plaintiff will seek civil penalties of one
5 hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation
6 and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each
7 subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f).

8 135. Section 2699, subdivision (a) provides that civil penalties may be “recovered
9 through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other
10 current or former employees.” (Code Civ. Proc., § 2699, subd. (a).) Section 2699, subdivision (g),
11 provides that an employee who prevails in a civil action under section 2699 shall be entitled to an
12 award of reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs.

13 136. The State of California, Plaintiff and aggrieved employees are, therefore, entitled
14 to civil penalties, attorneys’ fees and costs, according to proof.

15
16 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

19 **Class Certification**

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

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

23 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

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

25 4. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California
26 Labor Code Sections 201-203, 204, 245-248.6, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
27 1199 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all wages and correct sick
28

1 leave pay due;

2 5. For general unpaid wages as may be appropriate;

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

5 7. For liquidated damages;

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

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

10 As to the Second Cause of Action

11 10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California
12 Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

13 11. For unpaid meal period premium wages as may be appropriate;

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

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

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

20 As to the Third Cause of Action

21 15. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California
22 Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

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

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

1 18. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure Section
2 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

5 As to the Fourth Cause of Action

6 20. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated the record
7 keeping provisions of California Labor Code Section 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage
8 Orders, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

9 21. For penalties and actual damages pursuant to California Labor Code Section
10 226(e);

11 22. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this Section, pursuant to
12 California Labor Code Section 226(h);

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

14 24. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and
15 appropriate.
16

17 As to the Fifth Cause of Action

18 25. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California
19 Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the
20 time of termination of the employment;

21 26. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code Section 203 for
22 former employees who have left Defendant's employ;

23 27. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were
24 due;

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

26 29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and
27 appropriate.
28

1 As to the Sixth Cause of Action

2 30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated Labor Code
3 Section 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders;

4 31. For general unpaid wages and reimbursement of business expenses as may be
5 appropriate;

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

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

9 34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and
10 appropriate.
11

12 As to the Seventh Cause of Action

13 35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California
14 Business & Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay wages for all hours
15 worked (including minimum and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to
16 maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, and
17 failing to maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods, failing to furnish
18 accurate wage statements, and failing to indemnify necessary business expenses;

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

21 37. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all
22 funds disgorged from Defendant and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by
23 Defendant as a result of violations of California Business & Professions Code Sections
24 17200 *et seq.*;

25 38. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
26 California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5;
27
28

1 39. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this Section, pursuant to
2 California Business & Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*; and,

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

5 As to the Eighth Cause of Action

6 41. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the
7 California Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked and paid sick leave, failing
8 to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to
9 authorize and permit rest periods, failing to maintain accurate records of all hours worked and
10 meal periods, failing to indemnify necessary business expenses, failing to pay final wages at
11 termination, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;

12 42. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*, and all
13 other applicable Labor Code provisions;

14 43. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
15 California Labor Code § 2699;

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

18 As to all Causes of Action

19 45. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.

20 Dated: February 4, 2026

21 **TUNYAN LAW, APC**

22 

23
24
25 Lilit Tunyan
Artur Tunyan

26 Attorneys for Plaintiff PEDRO JIMENEZ,
27 as an individual and on behalf of all employees similarly situated
28

Exhibit “A”

November 17, 2025

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612
PAGAFilings@dir.ca.gov

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL
Return Receipt Requested

Marcos Vazquez
Agent for Service of Process for
1st Choice Electric Enterprises, Inc.
3241 Michelin Way
Modesto, CA 95355

**NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS PURSUANT TO
LABOR CODE SECTION § 2698 ET SEQ.**

Re: *Jimenez v. 1st Choice Electric Enterprises, Inc.*

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Pedro Jimenez (“Plaintiff”) to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against his former employer 1st Choice Electric Enterprises, Inc. (“Defendant”). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which Plaintiff alleges Defendant engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of Defendant’s aggrieved employees.

Plaintiff wishes to pursue a PAGA representative action on behalf of himself as an aggrieved employee, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of all other current and former aggrieved employees who worked for Defendant in California as an hourly paid, non-exempt employee at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the “Aggrieved Employees”).

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of Defendant suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

Factual Background Regarding Plaintiff's Employment with Defendant

Defendant owns and operates an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California. As such, Defendant is subject to the California Labor Code and the Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC").

Plaintiff worked for Defendant as an electrician from October 2024 to October 21, 2025 primarily in Stanislaus and Merced counties. Defendant classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from overtime. During the time period that Plaintiff was employed by Defendant, Plaintiff typically worked five days per week, and over eight hours each workday. Plaintiff was regularly scheduled to work from 6a.m. to 2:30p.m. However, he regularly worked over eight hours per shift beyond his scheduled shift hours.

Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendant committed numerous labor code violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendant was typical and illustrative.

Individual Liability Under Labor Code § 558.1

Labor Code § 558.1 permits joint and several liability as to both an individual and employer for violations of Labor Code §§ 203, 226, 226.7, 1194, and 2802. Defendant, at all relevant times, was an employer or person acting on behalf of employer(s) who violated Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees' rights by violating various sections of the California Labor Code. The California Legislature defines "other person acting on behalf of an employer" as "a natural person who is an owner, director, officer, or managing agent of the employer." The "managing agent" definition mirrors that found in California's punitive damages statute (subdivision (b) of section 3294 of the Civil Code). Under that statute and supporting case law, "managing agents" are all employees who exercise substantial independent authority and judgment in their corporate decision-making such that their decisions ultimately determine corporate policy. *White v. Ultramar, Inc.* (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 563, 566-67. For the reasons set forth above and others, at all relevant times, any above-listed individuals meet the criteria of managing agents under California Law, and therefore, may be held liable under California Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1 for violations of Labor Code §§ 203, 226, 226.7, and 1194 as further described in detail below.

Plaintiff intends to further name any unknown individuals responsible for violations arising under Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1 after further discovery. Plaintiff will ask the Court to relate the amendment of the PAGA charge and the operative complaint to the date of filing of these charges. Plaintiff asks and demands that Defendant put these individuals on notice immediately to provide them as much notice possible to mount in defense. In the alternative, Plaintiff also offers to Defendant to place those individuals on notice if Defendant voluntarily provides their contact information.

Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Overtime

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

In addition, 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.

Labor Code §1194, subdivision (a) provides that notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit. Further, pursuant to Labor Code §1197, payment of less than the minimum wage fixed by the Labor Commission is unlawful.

Labor Code § 1197 provides the California requirement that employees must be paid at least the minimum wage fixed by the IWC, and any payment of less than the minimum wage is unlawful. Furthermore, "in any action under Labor Code §§ 98, 1193 .6, 1194, or 1197.1 to recover wages because of the payment of a wage less than the minimum wage fixed by an order of the commission or by statute, an employee shall be entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon ... " See California Labor Code § 1194.2.

Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also 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, Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

In *Oliver v. Konica Minolta Business Solutions U.S.A., Inc.* (2020) 51 Cal.App.5th, the California Court of Appeal held that service technicians who used their personal vehicles to carry supplies and tools to and from customer locations "may" be entitled to compensation for their time driving from home to their first customer site in the morning and back to their home from their last customer site in the afternoon/evening, as well as mileage reimbursement.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked. Defendant regularly used a system of time rounding in a manner that resulted, over a period of time, in failing to compensate

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees properly for all the time they have actually worked, even though the realities of Defendant's operations are such that it is possible, practical, and feasible to count and pay for work time to the minute. Accordingly, Defendant frequently paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees less than all their work time. Some of this unpaid work also should have been paid at the overtime rate.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant also failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all actual time worked, failed to maintain accurate time records and falsified Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees' time records. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved employees have never been required to record their time and/or sign or verify the timesheets. Based on information and belief, Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees' supervisors would record the scheduled rounded shift hours worked by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees instead of them as opposed to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees clocking in and out electronically or recording their actual time on a handwritten timesheet themselves. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees would never see the time recorded by their supervisors or verify the hours worked by them. Based on information and belief, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have not been compensated for all actual time they worked, including the off-the-clock time worked by them beyond the scheduled work shift hours. Defendant refused to permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to personally record their actual time, and while recording Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees time instead of them, falsified the time records by not recording the actual time worked by Defendant depriving Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of wages.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant also failed to compensate for all time worked by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees by making them work off-the clock. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were regularly required to arrive at least thirty minutes to an hour earlier than their scheduled shift start time to be able to load the materials necessary for the assigned job into their personal vehicle from the container that was located outside of their jobsite location prior to the start of their shift and then continue driving to the jobsite. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were also required to work off-the-clock after the end of their shifts by driving to the same container to unload the remaining materials into the same container located outside of their jobsite prior to driving back from work. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not paid for the time spent on loading and unloading materials before and after the start of their shifts.

Throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were also required to respond to Defendant's work-related calls, text messages after the scheduled hours, off-the-clock, without compensation.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant also failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the commute time to their jobsites and back while Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to take the tools necessary for their work home and take them back to the jobsite next day, and they were required to carry these tools in their vehicles and were

prevented from using the commute for their own purposes. Defendant also failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the commute to the jobsites as the commute was longer than their normal commute.

Throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees would also work off-the-clock, without compensation, during their scheduled meal periods while Defendant's supervisors would record Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees' first meal periods regardless they actually took them or not. Defendant refused to permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to record their actual meal period time. In maintaining a practice of not paying all wages owed, Defendant failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including overtime. This conduct also results in violations of Labor Code §§ 218.5, 510, 558.1, 1198-1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 12(A). These violations subject Defendant to civil penalties under Labor Code §§ 558, 558.1, 218.5, and 2699, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 20. Each violation of each Labor Code Section and Wage Order provision results in a separate civil penalty, for each Aggrieved Employee, for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s).

Despite these legal requirements, Defendant wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees would often take interrupted first meal periods, regularly take late first meal periods and have never been authorized to take second meal periods when worked ten hours or more per shift. While Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were scheduled to start work at 6a.m. and would regularly start working earlier than their scheduled shift start time as described above, Defendant's supervisors would instruct them that they have a scheduled one-hour first meal period from 11a.m. to 12p.m. making their first meal periods by default taken

regularly late, after the fifth hour of work. Additionally, Defendant's supervisors would falsify and record Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees' one-hour rounded first meal periods and deduct one-hour of pay from Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees' wages regardless Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees actually took them, or whether the meal periods were actually one hour long or uninterrupted. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Based on information and belief, despite Defendant's failure to provide lawful meal periods, Defendant implemented a policy and/or practice of rounding the start and end times of Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees' meal periods and/or automatically deducting at least thirty minutes or one hour per shift for missed and/or otherwise unlawful meal periods (including meal periods restricted to Defendant's premises), despite having actual and/or constructive knowledge that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not receive lawful meal periods.

Moreover, based on information and belief, Defendant failed to keep accurate records of the true start and end times of Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees' meal periods. Based on information and belief, to the extent meal period were recorded, Defendant illegally rounded the start and end times of purported meal periods resulting in Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees not being paid for all time worked as well as late and/or shortened meal periods. See *Donohue v. AMN Services, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 58.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages. The aforementioned conduct also results in violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 1198- 1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 11(A) and (C) along with all applicable IWC Wage Orders. These violations subject Defendant to civil penalties under Labor Code §§ 558.1, 558 and 2699, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a separate civil penalty, for each Aggrieved Employee for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated. Defendant's failure to provide valid meal periods, and the automatic deduction for meal periods that were not provided/valid, ultimately results in further violations, such as violations of Labor Code sections 1174, 1199, 226.6, discussed above, and other violations discussed below.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of ten uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Defendant, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10 minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendant did not have a policy and did schedule rest periods every 4 hours or a major fraction. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have never been authorized and taken their first, second and third rest periods. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages. The aforementioned conduct also results in violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7, and 1198-1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §12(A). These violations subject Defendant to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558, 2699, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, § 20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a separate civil penalty, for each Aggrieved Employee for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked

Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. During the Class Period, Defendant failed to maintain accurate time records and falsified Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees' time records. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were never required to record their time and/or sign or verify the timesheets. Plaintiff believes Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees supervisors would complete the timesheets with hours worked by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees as opposed to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees clocking in and out electronically or recording their actual time on a handwritten timesheet. Plaintiff and the

Aggrieved Employees would never see the timesheets completed by their supervisors or verify the hours worked by them. Defendant refused to permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to personally record their actual time, and while recording Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees time falsified the time records.

Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendant's records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendant. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendant's knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 1174.5 for failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods. Defendant's failure to keep accurate and complete payroll records for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees violates Labor Code sections 1174, 1198, 1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7. These violations subject Defendant to civil penalties under Labor Code §§ 558.1, 226.6, 1174.5 and 2699. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision, for each Aggrieved Employee, results in a separate civil penalty.

Failure to Reimburse and Indemnify Expenses

California Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to reimburse employees for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of the employer.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendant without reimbursement. Defendant required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to purchase tools including but not limited to batteries, extensions, tool belts, hammers, screw drivers, and tape measurers necessary to perform their work but failed to reimburse for those tools. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees would purchase, keep and transport those tools to their jobsites in their personal vehicles.

While Defendant required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to use their personal cell phones to send pictures of the progress of work and send and receive other work-related texts

and calls from supervisors and coworkers, Plaintiff failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for a reasonable portion of their personal cell phone bills.

Additionally, Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the mileage when they used their personal vehicles to drive to the jobsites as Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to take the tools necessary for their work home and take them back to the jobsite next day and the usual commute to the jobsite was more than 50 miles away. While Defendant initially provided \$100 allowance for some time period as a mileage reimbursement to Plaintiff, Defendant stopped providing that allowance and terminated Plaintiff's employment when Plaintiff raised a concern about discontinuing the travel allowance.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, and Defendant have failed to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

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

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendant failed and continues to fail to pay Plaintiff and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendant's employ. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum and straight time wages), missed meal periods, and missed rest periods.

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

Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination. Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

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. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).

The statute further provides: “An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.” Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).

Defendant intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to provide to correctly list gross wages earned, and the failure to list the true net wages earned, including wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and correct wages earned for all hours worked.

As a result of Defendant violating Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendant’s failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 dollars per employee. Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

Based on its failure to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Defendant also violated Labor Code § 204.

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays. Labor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. Lab. Code § 204(a). The requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Lab. Code § 204(d).

Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were also entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for hours worked. However, during all such times, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Defendant owe employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Failure to Provide Paid Sick Leave and Written Notice of Available Paid Sick Leave (Violations of Labor Code §§ 245-248.5)

Pursuant to Labor Code § 246 (a) an employee who, on or after July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days.

Labor Code § 246 (i) requires employers to provide an employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available.

Throughout the relevant time period, Defendant improperly calculated the sick leave accrual and the sick leave rate of pay owed to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees by failing to base the accrued sick leave hours on the correct number of hours worked (as a result of the rounding policies and practices for meal periods and/or shift start and end times/other required off-the-clock work including but not limited to work completed during unpaid meal periods).

Based on information and belief, Defendant further failed to provide notice of the correct sick leave amount balance available to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees on their wage statements or other written statements.

In violation of Labor Code § 247.5 Defendant failed to maintain accurate records documenting the hours worked and paid sick days accrued and used by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, permitting the presumption that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to the maximum number of hours accruable under this article.

On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that all of these practices were experienced and continue to be experienced by the Aggrieved Employees. Plaintiff requests all appropriate relief under the PAGA and these statutes, including but not limited to the restitution of earned paid sick leave that could have been used, but was not due to Defendant's sole failure to institute such a paid sick leave entitlement or paid sick leave bank as required by California law.

Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to injunctive relief, attorney's fees, declaratory relief, restitution, and penalties as permitted by law. Plaintiff requests all relief pursuant to the aforementioned code provisions, including but not limited to Labor Code §§ 233 and 234, which incorporates the paid sick leave requirements. Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide any information on accrued sick leave.

Standard Conditions of Labor Violations

Together, Labor Code §§ 1198 and 1199 make unlawful any employment of any employee under conditions of labor prohibited by the Wage Orders, and any violation, refusal, or neglect to comply with any provision within Part 4, Chapter 1 of the Labor Code, including §§ 1174, 1197, and 1198, or order or ruling of the commission.

Therefore, Defendant's violations, including but not limited to, with respect to meal periods, rest periods, recordkeeping provisions, minimum wages and overtime wages, business expenses and other violations described herein result in separate violations of §§ 1198 and 1199, which subject Defendant to civil penalties under Labor Code §§ 1197.1 and 2699.

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees including but not limited to Labor Code §§ 201-203, 204, 226, 226.7, 245-248.6, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2802 and all applicable Wage Orders.

Defendant has violated the above-referenced California Labor Code provisions, the applicable IWC Wage Order, including but not limited to all applicable Wage Orders, as well as other laws,

and is liable for all applicable premium wages, statutory and civil penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs. The civil penalties Plaintiff and The Aggrieved Employees seek to recover include, but are not limited to, the statutory and civil penalties specified above.

Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff seeks applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 218.5, 225.5, 226, 226.3, 226.6, 233, 234, 558, 558.1, 1174.5, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, and 2699(f)(2).

Plaintiff has placed Defendant on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence to its corporate address and address of the agent for service, as indicated on the first page.

The facts and claims contained herein are based on the information available at the time of this writing. Therefore, if through discovery and/or expert review, Plaintiff becomes aware of additional compensation owed or losses incurred by Plaintiff or by any other aggrieved employee of Defendant or any additional facts, Plaintiff expressly reserves the right to revise these facts and/or add any new claims by amending the claim letter or by adding applicable causes of action to the complaint which will relate back to the date of this letter.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Lilit Tunyan, Esq.
TUNYAN LAW, APC

From: noreply@salesforce.com on behalf of [LWDA DO NOT REPLY](#)
To: ltunyan@tunyanlaw.com
Subject: Thank you for submission of your PAGA Case.
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 5:52:52 AM

11/17/2025

LWDA Case No. LWDA-CM-1138457-25
Law Firm : Tunyan Law, APC
Plaintiff Name : Pedro Jimenez
Employer: 1st Choice Electric Enterprises, Inc.
Filing Fee : \$75.00
IFP Claimed : No

Item submitted: Initial PAGA Notice

Thank you for your submission to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency. Please make a note of the LWDA Case No. above as you may need this number for future reference when filing any subsequent documents for this Case.

Please note that a PAGA Notice is not a complaint within the meaning of Division 5 (Labor Code §§6300 et seq.). To file a complaint about workplace safety and health hazards with Cal/OSHA, please visit:
<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/complaint.htm>

If you have questions or concerns regarding this submission or your case, please send an email to pagainfo@dir.ca.gov.

DIR PAGA Unit on behalf of
Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Website: http://labor.ca.gov/Private_Attorneys_General_Act.htm

9589 0710 5270 2533 8830 03

U.S. Postal Service™ CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

Modesto, CA 95355

Certified Mail Fee \$5.30
Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)
☐ Return Receipt (hardcopy) \$0.00
☐ Return Receipt (electronic) \$0.00
☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$0.00
☐ Adult Signature Required \$0.00
☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$0.00

Postage \$2.17

Total Postage and Fees \$11.87

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or P

City, State, ZIP+4®

PS Form 3800, January

MARCOS VASQUEZ
AGENT FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS FOR
1ST CHOICE ELECTRIC ENTERPRISES, INC.
3241 MICHELIN WAY
MODESTO, CA 95355



GLENDALE
313 E BROADWAY
GLENDALE, CA 91205-9998
www.usps.com

11/17/2025

12:56 PM

TRACKING NUMBERS

9405 5301 0935 5239 4320 99
9589 0710 5270 2533 8830 03

TRACK STATUS OF ITEMS WITH THIS CODE
(UP TO 25 ITEMS)



TRACK STATUS BY TEXT MESSAGE
Send tracking number to 28777 (2USPS)
Standard message and data rates may apply

TRACK STATUS ONLINE
Visit <https://www.usps.com/tracking>
Text and e-mail alerts available

PURCHASE DETAILS

Product	Qty	Unit Price	Price
Prepaid Mail	1		\$0.00
Los Angeles, CA 90001			
Weight: 0 lb 1.60 oz			
Acceptance Date:			
Mon 11/17/2025			
Tracking #:			
9405 5301 0935 5239 4320 99			
First-Class Mail®	1		\$2.17
Large Envelope			
Modesto, CA 95355			
Weight: 0 lb 2.60 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date			
Fri 11/21/2025			
Certified Mail®			\$5.30
Tracking #:			
9589 0710 5270 2533 8830 03			
Return Receipt			\$4.40
Tracking #:			
9590 9402 8114 2349 9453 83			
Total			\$11.87
Grand Total:			\$11.87
Credit Card Remit			\$11.87
Card Name: AMEX			
Account #: XXXXXXXXXXXX1001			
Approval #: 893070			
Transaction #: 908			
AID: A000000025010801 Contactless			
AL: AMERICAN EXPRESS			
PIN: Not Required			

TO REPORT AN ISSUE
Visit <https://email.usps.com>

All hazardous labels/markings on reused boxes MUST be completely removed/obliterated if they no longer match the contents.

In a hurry? Self-service kiosks offer quick and easy check-out. Any Retail Associate can show you how.

PREVIEW YOUR MAIL AND PACKAGES
Sign up for FREE at

1
2 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**
3
4

5 Plaintiff PEDRO JIMENEZ hereby demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.
6
7

8 Dated: February 4, 2026

TUNYAN LAW, PAC

9
10 

11 _____
Lilit Tunyan

12 Artur Tunyan

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff PEDRO JIMENEZ,

14 as an individual and on behalf of all employees similarly situated
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

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

6 I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18
7 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 535 N Brand Blvd., Suite 285,
8 Glendale, CA 91203. On February 4, 2026, I served the foregoing document described as:

9 On the date indicated below, I served the document described as: **FIRST AMENDED**
10 **COMPLAINT** on the interested parties in this action by sending a true copy thereof to interested
11 parties as follows and as stated on the attached service list:

12 David C. Johnston
13 david@johnstonbusinesslaw.com
14 Attorney at law
15 1600 G Street, Suite 102
16 Modesto, California 95354
17 Telephone : (209) 579-1150
18 Facsimile: (209) 900-9199

19 ***Attorneys for Defendant 1ST CHOICE***
20 ***ELECTRIC ENTERPRISES, INC.***

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

24 [✓] **BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE:** Based on a court order, Rule of Court, or an agreement of
25 the parties to accept electronic service, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at
26 the electronic service addresses listed above via electronic mail. I did not receive an error
27 message.

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

Executed on February 4, 2026, at Los Angeles, California.

Natalia Zevallos

Name



Signature