

1 Kristapor Vartanian (SBN 275378)
kvartanian@kvlawpc.com
2 **KV LAW, P.C.**
11400 West Olympic Blvd. Suite 200 #2042
3 Los Angeles, CA 90064
Telephone: (213) 799-3730
4

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff
Shahla Karimi

6 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
7 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

8 SHAHLA KARIMI, on behalf of the general
public and the State of California as private
9 attorney general,

10 Plaintiff,

11 vs.

12 ARARAT HOME OF LOS ANGELES, INC., a
California nonprofit corporation; and DOES 1
13 through 10, inclusive;

14 Defendants.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
3/10/2026 5:46 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By G. Delgado, Deputy Clerk

CASE NO. **26STCV07782**

**PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT ("PAGA") REPRESENTATIVE
ACTION COMPLAINT PURSUANT TO
LABOR CODE §§ 2698 et seq.**

1 Plaintiff Shahla Karimi (“Plaintiff” or “Karimi”), on behalf of the people of the State of
2 California and as an “aggrieved employee” acting as a private attorney general under the Private
3 Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.* (“PAGA”) alleges, on
4 information and belief, except for her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal
5 knowledge, the following:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Ararat Home of Los Angeles, Inc, and Does 1
8 through 10 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for civil penalties under the PAGA stemming
9 from Defendants’ (i) failure to pay minimum wages; (ii) failure to pay overtime wages; (iii) failure to
10 provide uninterrupted and compliant meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof; (iv) failure to
11 provide uninterrupted and compliant rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof; (v) failure to
12 properly pay sick pay; (vi) failure to maintain accurate records; (vii) failure to timely pay wages during
13 employment and upon termination; (viii) failure to furnish accurate itemized wage statements; (ix)
14 failure to indemnify necessary business expenses; and (x) illegal restrictive covenants.

15 2. Plaintiff is not seeking general and/or special damages, restitution or other damages
16 other than civil penalties. That is, California has enacted PAGA to permit an individual to bring an
17 action on behalf of themselves and on behalf of others for PAGA penalties only, which is the precise
18 and sole nature of this action.

19 3. The “Aggrieved Employees” are:

- 20 a. For claims/theories associated with subsections (i)-(viii) in Paragraph 1: all current
21 and former employees who worked for Defendants in California as hourly, non-
22 exempt employees at any time from one year prior to the postmark date of the
23 initial PAGA notice through the date of trial.
- 24 b. For claims/theories associated with subsections (ix)-(x) in Paragraph 1: all current
25 and former employees who worked for Defendants in California at any time from
26 one year prior to the postmark date of the initial PAGA notice through the date of
27 trial.

1 4. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants seeking only to recover penalties for
2 Plaintiff, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees that worked for Defendants, and on behalf of the State
3 of California. Plaintiff does not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by
4 California Labor Code § 2699 at this time. To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for
5 wage violations, Plaintiff does not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those
6 violations, but simply penalties as permitted by California Labor Code § 2699, declaratory relief, and
7 injunctive relief for Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees as permitted by the PAGA.

8 5. Defendants own/owned and/or operate/operated an industry, business, and
9 establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. As such, and based upon
10 all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants are subject
11 to the California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Orders.

12 6. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a
13 systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 14 a. Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum wages,
15 overtime wages, premium wages, and sick pay wages, in compliance with the
16 California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;
- 17 b. Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in compliance
18 with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing to maintain accurate
19 records of all meal periods taken, restricted, interrupted, or missed, and failing to
20 pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period violation occurred;
- 21 c. Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free rest periods in compliance
22 with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, and failing to pay an
23 additional hour's pay for each workday a rest period violation occurred;
- 24 d. Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred;
- 25 e. Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, overtime wages, premium
26 wages, and sick pay wages due within the time period specified by California law;
- 27 f. Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked;

- 1 g. Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements containing
2 all the information required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;
3 and
4 h. Requiring illegal restrictive covenants.

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

9 8. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the
10 unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing
11 paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants are
12 responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of
13 "respondeat superior".

14 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15 9. This Court has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to the California Constitution,
16 Article VI, § 10, as the causes of action are premised upon violations of California law.

17 10. The monetary amounts sought exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior
18 Court.

19 11. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants are citizens of
20 California, employed Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in Los Angeles County, California,
21 have their principal place of business in Los Angeles County, and upon information and belief, they
22 conduct regular and substantial business, and have substantial contacts, in California, and/or otherwise
23 intentionally avail themselves to the California (and Los Angeles County) market so as to render the
24 exercise of jurisdiction in California proper.

25 12. Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 395, 393(a) and/or 395.5, venue is
26 proper in this judicial district. Los Angeles County is the proper venue, particularly because
27 Defendants employed Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in Los Angeles County, Defendants
28 maintain offices, have agents, employ individuals and/or transact business in Los Angeles County,

1 and the transactions, occurrences, breaches and/or violations that give rise to this lawsuit occurred
2 within Los Angeles County.

3 **PARTIES**

4 13. Plaintiff is a California resident who has worked for Defendants as an employee in Los
5 Angeles County, California, from approximately 2016 until approximately January 18, 2025.

6 14. The State of California, via the Labor and Workforce Development Agency
7 (“LWDA”), is the real party in interest in this action. (*Kim v. Reins Int’l Calif., Inc.*, 9 Cal. 5th 73, 81
8 (2020) (the “government entity on whose behalf the plaintiff files suit is always the real party in
9 interest.”).) To the extent permitted by law, including pursuant *Balderas v. Fresh Start Harvesting,*
10 *Inc.*, 101 Cal. App. 5th 533 (2024) and *Rodriguez v. Packers Sanitation Servs. Ltd.*, 109 Cal. App. 5th
11 69 (2025), the PAGA claim is brought exclusively as a representative action and does not include
12 arbitrable claims.

13 15. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new plaintiffs,
14 if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *Hutcheson v. Superior Court*,
15 74 Cal. App. 5th 923 (2022), *La Sala v. Am. Savings and Loan Ass’n*, 5 Cal.3d 864, 872 (1971), and
16 other applicable law.

17 16. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based upon that information and belief alleges,
18 that Ararat Home of Los Angeles, Inc. is:

- 19 a. A California nonprofit corporation, with its principal places of business in Los
20 Angeles County, California.
- 21 b. A business entity conducting business in the State of California, including in Los
22 Angeles County.
- 23 c. The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer of the
24 Aggrieved Employees. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the
25 Aggrieved Employees to work and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working
26 conditions.
- 27 d. At all times alleged herein, Defendants are and were the employers of Plaintiff and
28 the Aggrieved Employees.

17. Plaintiff does not currently know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

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

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

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

20. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants in Los Angeles County, California, during the statutory period. During the statutory period, Defendants classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from California's overtime requirements, and paid Plaintiff an hourly wage.

21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours worked (including minimum wages, overtime wages, and premium wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with

1 uninterrupted and compliant meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof, failed to provide Plaintiff
2 with uninterrupted and compliant rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof, failed to pay at the
3 regular rate of pay when required, failed to maintain accurate records, failed to indemnify Plaintiff for
4 necessary business expenses, failed to timely and properly pay all wages to Plaintiff (including at
5 termination), and failed to furnish accurate wage statements. Plaintiff's experience working for
6 Defendants was typical and illustrative.

7 22. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
8 Employees, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees'
9 employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

10 23. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's
11 and the Aggrieved Employees' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and the other
12 Aggrieved Employees.

13 24. Defendants directly hired and paid wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

14 25. Throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, from time
15 to time, worked over eight (8) hours in a day, and/or forty (40) hours in a week during their
16 employment with Defendants, and were not properly paid all overtime.

17 26. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not
18 paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime and
19 minimum wages. Throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were
20 required to work off-the-clock, and uncompensated. Among other things, Defendants required
21 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to work while clocked out during what is supposed to be
22 their off-duty meal breaks. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were also required to perform job
23 duties off the clock, including before and/or after their scheduled shifts and during their meal or rest
24 breaks – including, but not limited to, assisting patients, communicating with management,
25 supervisors, and co-workers related to work, completing tasks and other work during breaks due to
26 their rigorous work schedules and lack of coverage/support, responding to supervisors and other
27 employees regarding work-related inquiries, preparing for shift start, and otherwise being required to
28 remain available for work during breaks. Defendants also had a policy and practice of unilaterally

1 falsifying and altering the clock in/out records for Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees so that
2 those records falsely showed that employees had clocked out for meal breaks before the fifth hour of
3 working (and clocked back in no less than 30 minutes thereafter) when that was false.

4 27. Defendants also fail to properly calculate the “regular rate of pay” for purposes of
5 calculating, *inter alia*, overtime, meal/rest break premium pay, and sick pay.

6 28. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to relieve Plaintiff and the
7 Aggrieved Employees of all duties, failed to relinquish control over Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
8 Employees’ activities, failed to permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees a reasonable
9 opportunity to take, and impeded, restricted (including geographically), or discouraged them from
10 taking, thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal breaks no later than the end of their fifth hour of work
11 for shifts lasting at least six (6) hours.

12 29. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
13 were entitled to receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff’s and
14 the Aggrieved Employees’ regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, shortened, late,
15 interrupted, restricted to the premises and/or otherwise not compliant with the requirements of
16 applicable California law, and they did not receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour
17 of pay at Plaintiff’s and the Aggrieved Employees’ regular rate of pay when a meal period was not
18 compliant with California law.

19 30. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to provide, authorize, and permit
20 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take full, uninterrupted, off-duty, unrestricted (including
21 geographically), and otherwise legally compliant rest periods for every shift lasting three and one-half
22 (3.5) to six (6) hours and/or two full, uninterrupted, off-duty and otherwise legally compliant rest
23 periods for every shift lasting six (6) to ten (10) hours, and/or three full, uninterrupted, off-duty and
24 otherwise legally compliant rest periods for every shift lasting more than ten (10) hours, and failed to
25 make a good faith effort to authorize, permit, and provide such rest breaks in the middle of each work
26 period.

27 31. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
28 were entitled to receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff’s and the

1 other Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, shortened, late,
2 interrupted, on-duty, restricted to the premises and/or otherwise not compliant with the requirements
3 of applicable California law, and they did not receive all rest periods or payment of one additional
4 hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay when a rest period
5 was not compliant with California law.

6 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
7 should have known that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive at least
8 minimum wages for compensation and that they were not receiving at least minimum wages for all
9 hours worked. Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages included, *inter alia*, Defendants' effective
10 payment of zero dollars per hour for hours Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees worked off
11 the clock performing work duties, including (but not limited to) duties such as those described in
12 herein.

13 33. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and the
14 Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements in accordance with California law.
15 The deficiencies included, *inter alia*, the failure to include (i) the accurate total number of hours
16 worked by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees; (ii) the accurate and applicable rates of pay in
17 effect during each pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; (iii)
18 the accurate gross wages and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned
19 for hours worked, correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not
20 provided in accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized
21 or permitted in accordance with California law, and correct sick pay wages); and (iv) complete and
22 correct deductions. As a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiff and
23 the Aggrieved Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

- 24 a. the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid minimum
25 wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium
26 wages to which they were entitled, even though they were entitled;
- 27
28

- 1 b. the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum, overtime,
2 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even though they had not
3 been;
- 4 c. the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum,
5 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct
6 California rate even though they were;
- 7 d. the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime, meal
8 period premium, rest period premium wages, and sick pay at the correct California
9 rate even though they had not been;
- 10 e. the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum, overtime,
11 meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- 12 f. in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
13 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have to
14 perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed to
15 them, computations they would not have to make if the wage statements contained
16 the required accurate information;
- 17 g. by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to lose
18 entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability,
19 unemployment, and other governmental benefits; and
- 20 h. the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages rates to
21 which Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled, and Plaintiff and the
22 Aggrieved Employees were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they
23 were entitled.

24 34. Defendants also failed to keep complete and accurate employment and payroll records
25 for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in accordance with California law, including Cal. Lab.
26 Code §§ 226(a), 1174(d), and the IWC Wage Orders.

27 35. During the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
28 Employees their correct wages owed upon separation from Defendants' employment and accordingly

1 owe waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 203. Further, Plaintiff is informed and
2 believes and based thereon alleges that such failure to pay at the regular rate was willful, such that
3 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees whose employment has separated are entitled to waiting time
4 penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203.

5 36. During the statutory period, Defendants did not reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
6 Employees for necessary business-related expenses, including (without limitation), expenses related
7 to the purchase and maintenance (including laundering) of various uniform items (including but not
8 limited to scrubs, shoes, and white jeans), expenses related to complying with Defendants' dress code
9 and grooming policies, and personal cell phone expenses (which were used for work purposes).

10 37. Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate and
11 reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had
12 the financial ability to pay such compensation and reimbursement, but willfully, knowingly, and
13 intentionally failed to do so, and falsely represented to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees that
14 they were properly paid all wages and reimbursements, all in order to increase Defendants' profits.

15 38. Defendants also forced Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, as a condition of
16 employment, to sign and abide by overbroad Confidentiality Agreements, which required employees
17 to refrain from "disclos[ing] or discuss[ing]" their wages with others, in violation of California Labor
18 Code §§ 232(a), 232(b), 232.5(a), 232.5(b), 1197.5(k), and 432.5. Such restrictive
19 covenants/agreements violate California law.

20 39. All of the conduct and violations alleged herein occurred during the statutory period.

21 40. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
22 were entitled to receive certain wages and that they were not receiving accurate compensation for all
23 hours worked.

24 41. As a result of the above facts, during the relevant time period, Defendants were and
25 continue to be in violation of the California Labor Code, including §§ 200-204, 204b, 210, 226, 226.3,
26 226.7, 232, 232.5, 233, 245-249, 432.5, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1175, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
27 1197.5, 1198, 1198.5, 2800, 2802, and 2804 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders related to these
28 claims arising under the California Labor Code.

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties under PAGA)**

3 42. Plaintiff incorporates herein by this reference all paragraphs above as though fully set
4 forth herein

5 43. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the California Labor Code
6 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

7 44. California Labor Code § 2699 specifically provides for a private right of action to
8 recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any
9 provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and
10 Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies,
11 or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action
12 brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former
13 employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.”

14 45. Plaintiff brings this cause of action as a proxy for the State of California on behalf of
15 the following “aggrieved employees” pursuant to PAGA, codified as Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*:

16 a. For claims/theories associated with subsections (i)-(viii) in Paragraph 1: all current
17 and former employees who worked for Defendants in California as hourly, non-
18 exempt employees at any time from one year prior to the postmark date of the
19 initial PAGA notice through the date of trial.

20 b. For claims/theories associated with subsections (ix)-(x) in Paragraph 1: all current
21 and former employees who worked for Defendants in California at any time from
22 one year prior to the postmark date of the initial PAGA notice through the date of
23 trial.

24 46. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, supplement, or add to this description of the
25 Aggrieved Employees, according to proof.

26 47. Labor Code § 2699.3 sets forth the procedure for commencing an action for civil
27 penalties under the PAGA.
28

1 48. Plaintiff has exhausted the administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor Code
2 § 2699.3. On November 12, 2025, Plaintiff paid the requisite PAGA filing fee and on that same date,
3 and via amended notice on January 7, 2026, provided written notice by online filing to the LWDA
4 and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants
5 allegedly violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. A true and correct
6 copy of Plaintiff's written PAGA notices are attached hereto as omnibus Exhibit A.

7 49. To date, neither Plaintiff nor Plaintiff's counsel has received a response to the PAGA
8 notices from the LWDA.

9 50. Within 33 calendar days of the postmark date of the notice(s) sent by Plaintiff, neither
10 Plaintiff nor Plaintiff's counsel has received written notice by certified mail from any defendant
11 providing a description of any actions taken to cure the alleged violations.

12 51. Now that at least 65 days have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendants of these
13 violations, without notice of cure from Defendants or notice from the LWDA of its intent to
14 investigate the alleged allegations and issue the appropriate citations to Defendants, Plaintiff
15 exhausted all prerequisites and commenced this civil action under Labor Code §§ 2699 *et seq*

16 52. As alleged, Defendants committed the following violations and are liable for all
17 corresponding civil penalties:

- 18 a. ***Unpaid Hours Worked/Minimum Wage.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197,
19 1197.1, 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- 20 b. ***Unpaid Overtime.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198; IWC Wage
21 Orders.
- 22 c. ***Improper Sick Pay.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 201-204, 233 and 246.
- 23 d. ***Unpaid Meal Period Premium Wages.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512,
24 516, 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- 25 e. ***Unpaid Rest Period Premium Wages.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516,
26 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- 27 f. ***Untimely Payment of Wages During Employment and Upon Termination.***
28 Violation of Labor Code §§ 201-204, 204b, 210.

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

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

7. Such other and further relief that the Court deems proper.

Date: March 10, 2026

KV LAW, P.C.

/s/ Kristapor Vartanian

By: _____

Kristapor Vartanian

Attorney for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT A

KV LAW, P.C.

KRISTAPOR VARTANIAN
DIRECT DIAL: (213) 799-3734
E-MAIL: kvartanian@kvlawpc.com

November 12, 2025

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Ararat Home of Los Angeles, Inc.
Attn: Derik G. Ghookasian
15105 Mission Hills Road
Mission Hills, California 91345

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

California Labor & Workforce Development
Agency ("LWDA")
(<https://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html>)

Re: NOTICE PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE §§ 2698, *et seq.*

To Whom It May Concern:

Our office has been retained to represent plaintiff Shahla Karimi ("Plaintiff") and the Aggrieved Employees (defined below) against Ararat Home of Los Angeles, Inc. (the "Company") for violations of California wage-and-hour laws.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the Aggrieved Employees, gives notice to commence and/or amend a civil action pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*

"Aggrieved Employees" refers to all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant in California as an hourly, non-exempt employee during the time period of November 12, 2024 until a date as determined by the Court. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from approximately 2016 until January 2025 as a non-exempt employee. Plaintiff contends that Defendant unlawfully failed (and fails) to pay all wages (including at the correct rate) during employment and upon termination -- including minimum wages, overtime wages, premium wages, and sick pay wages; failed (and fails) to provide uninterrupted and compliant meal periods; failed (and fails) to provide uninterrupted and compliant rest periods; failed (and fails) to indemnify necessary business expenses; failed (and fails) to furnish accurate itemized wage statements; and failed (and fails) to keep accurate records. This conduct, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated complaint, violates California Labor Code §§ 200-204, 210, 223, 226, 226.7, 233, 245-247, 249, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1175, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and are therefore actionable under California Labor Code § 2699.3.

A copy of the complaint by Plaintiff against the Company, which (i) identifies the alleged violations; (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations; (iii) sets forth the people/entities, violations, events, actions, and the like to the extent known to Plaintiff; and (iv) sets forth the Company's illegal practices, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the LWDA of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the Agency's reference.

November 12, 2025

Page 2

Thus, Plaintiff hereby incorporates the allegations of the attached complaint into this Notice as if fully set forth herein.

This Notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a civil action against the Company as authorized by California Labor Code §§ 2699 *et seq.*

Your earliest response to this Notice is greatly appreciated. If the Agency has any questions or needs any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully,

KV LAW, P.C.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Kristapor Vartanian", is written over a horizontal line.

Kristapor Vartanian, Esq.

Enclosure

Kristapor Vartanian (SBN 275378)
kvartanian@kvlawpc.com
KV LAW, P.C.
11400 West Olympic Blvd. Suite 200 #2042
Los Angeles, CA 90064
Telephone: (213) 799-3730

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Shahla Karimi

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

SHAHLA KARIMI, on behalf of herself and
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ARARAT HOME OF LOS ANGELES, INC., a
California nonprofit corporation; and DOES 1
through 25 inclusive;

Defendants.

CASE NO.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:
(1) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime)
(2) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Unpaid Meal Period Premiums)
(3) Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 (Failure to Provide Rest Periods and Unpaid Rest Period Premiums)
(4) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 (Unpaid Minimum Wages)
(5) Violation of California Labor Code (Failure to Timely Pay Wages)
(6) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1174 (Non-Compliant Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Records)
(7) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Unreimbursed Business Expenses)
(8) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201-204, 233, and 246 (Failure to Pay Sick Pay Wages)
(9) Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff Shahla Karimi (“Plaintiff” or “Karimi”), based on facts that either have evidentiary
2 support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further
3 investigation and discovery, alleges as follows, individually and on behalf of other similarly situated
4 employees:

5 **INTRODUCTION**

6 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendant Ararat Home of Los Angeles, Inc., and
7 Does 1 through 25 (Defendants are collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor
8 Code violations and unfair business practices stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay all wages
9 (including minimum wages, overtime wages, premium wages, and sick pay wages), failure to provide
10 uninterrupted and compliant meal periods, failure to provide uninterrupted and compliant rest periods,
11 failure to indemnify necessary business expenses, and failure to furnish accurate itemized wage
12 statements.

13 2. Plaintiff brings the First through Ninth Causes of Action individually and as a class
14 action on behalf of herself and all other employees of Defendants (hereinafter collectively referred to
15 as the “Class” or “Class Members” and defined more fully below). The Class consists of Plaintiff and
16 all other California non-exempt employees of Defendants during the statute of limitations period
17 applicable to the claims pleaded here.

18 3. Defendants own/owned and/or operate/operated an industry, business, and
19 establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. As such, and based upon
20 all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants’ business in California, Defendants are subject
21 to the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Orders, and the
22 California Business & Professions Code.

23 4. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a
24 systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 25 a. Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum wages,
26 overtime wages, premium wages, and sick pay wages, in compliance with the
27 California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;

1 given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any
2 other basis for jurisdiction.

3 9. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants are citizens of
4 California, employed Plaintiff and other Class Members in Los Angeles County, California, have their
5 principal place of business in Los Angeles County, and upon information and belief, they conduct
6 regular and substantial business, and have substantial contacts, in California, and/or otherwise
7 intentionally avail themselves to the California (and Los Angeles County) market so as to render the
8 exercise of jurisdiction in California proper.

9 10. Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 395, venue is proper in this judicial
10 district. Los Angeles County is the proper venue, particularly because Defendants employed Plaintiff
11 and other Class Members in Los Angeles County, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, employ
12 individuals and/or transact business in Los Angeles County, and the transactions, occurrences,
13 breaches and/or violations that give rise to this lawsuit occurred within Los Angeles County.

14 **PARTIES**

15 11. Plaintiff is a California resident who has worked for Defendants in Los Angeles
16 County, California, from approximately 2016 until January 2025.

17 12. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new plaintiffs,
18 if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v. Am. Savings and*
19 *Loan Ass'n*, 5 Cal.3d 864, 872 (1971) and other applicable law.

20 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based upon that information and belief alleges,
21 that Ararat Home of Los Angeles, Inc. is:

- 22 a. A California nonprofit corporation, with its principal place of business in Los
23 Angeles County, California.
- 24 b. A business entity conducting business in the State of California, including in Los
25 Angeles County.
- 26 c. The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and former employer of the
27 putative Class. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the Class to work
28 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

1 d. At all times alleged herein, Defendants are and were the employers of Plaintiff and
2 the Class.

3 14. Plaintiff does not currently know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities
4 sued herein as Does 1-25, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names.
5 Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by
6 Plaintiff and the Class as alleged herein. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to set forth the true names
7 and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained, together with appropriate
8 charging allegations, as may be necessary.

9 15. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-25, inclusive, and each
10 of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or injured
11 a significant number of the Plaintiff and the Class in the State of California.

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

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

26 17. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other persons
27 as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California, including the County of Los
28 Angeles.

1 18. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid, non-exempt
2 employee, from approximately 2016 until January 2025, in the State of California, County of Los
3 Angeles.

4 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours worked
5 (including minimum wages, overtime wages, and premium wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with
6 uninterrupted and compliant meal periods, failed to provide Plaintiff with uninterrupted and compliant
7 rest periods, failed to pay Plaintiff at the regular rate of pay when required, failed to indemnify
8 Plaintiff for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all wages to Plaintiff, and failed to
9 furnish accurate wage statements. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendants
10 was typical and illustrative.

11 20. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the other class and
12 subclass members, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff's and the other class and
13 subclass members' employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

14 21. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's
15 and the other class and subclass members' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and
16 the other class and subclass members.

17 22. Defendants directly hired and paid wages, other compensation, and benefits to Plaintiff
18 and the other class and subclass members.

19 23. Defendants continue to employ hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State
20 of California.

21 24. Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members worked over eight (8) hours in a
22 day, and/or forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.

23 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants engaged
24 (and continue to engage) in a pattern and practice of wage abuse against their hourly-paid or non-
25 exempt employees within the State of California. This pattern and practice involved/involves, *inter*
26 *alia*, failing to pay them for all regular, overtime, minimum, and/or other wages earned, and for
27 missed, shortened, late, interrupted, restricted and/or otherwise non-compliant meal and rest periods
28 in violation of California law.

1 26. Defendants were required to pay Plaintiff and putative class and subclass members for
2 all their time worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an
3 employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. Defendants required
4 Plaintiff and class and subclass members to work without paying them for all the time they are or
5 were under Defendants' control. Among other things, Defendants required Plaintiff and other class
6 and subclass members to work while clocked out during what is supposed to be their off-duty meal
7 breaks. Plaintiffs and class and subclass members were also required to perform job duties off the
8 clock, including before and/or after their scheduled shifts and during their meal or rest breaks –
9 including, but not limited to, assisting patients, communicating with management, supervisors, and
10 co-workers related to work, completing tasks and other work during breaks due to their rigorous work
11 schedules and lack of coverage/support, responding to supervisors and other employees regarding
12 work-related inquires, preparing for shift start, and otherwise being required to remain available for
13 work during breaks. Defendants also had a policy and practice of unilaterally falsifying and altering
14 the clock in/out records for Plaintiff and other class and subclass members so that those records falsely
15 showed that employees had clocked out for meal breaks before the fifth hour of working (and clocked
16 back in no less than 30 minutes thereafter) when that was a complete falsity.

17 27. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class and subclass
18 members were entitled to receive certain wages and that they were not receiving accurate
19 compensation for all hours worked. In fact, Plaintiff and others *raised these issues with Defendants*
20 *on multiple occasions*, to no avail.

21 28. Defendants also fail to properly calculate the “regular rate of pay” for purposes of
22 calculating, *inter alia*, overtime, meal/rest break premium pay, and sick pay.

23 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed to
24 provide Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members all required, legally compliant rest and
25 meal periods during the relevant time period as required under the IWC Wage Orders and thus they
26 are entitled to any and all applicable penalties for such violations.

27 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed to
28 relieve Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members of all duties, failed to relinquish control

1 over Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members' activities, failed to permit Plaintiff and the
2 other class and subclass members a reasonable opportunity to take, and impeded, restricted (including
3 geographically), or discouraged them from taking, thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal breaks no
4 later than the end of their fifth hour of work for shifts lasting at least six (6) hours. In fact, Defendants
5 falsified break records instead.

6 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
7 should have known that Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members were entitled to receive
8 all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other class and subclass
9 members' regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, shortened, late, interrupted, restricted
10 to the premises and/or otherwise not compliant with the requirements of applicable California law,
11 and they did not receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and
12 the other class and subclass members' regular rate of pay when a meal period was not compliant with
13 California law.

14 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed to
15 provide, authorize, and permit Plaintiff and other class and subclass members to take full,
16 uninterrupted, off-duty, unrestricted (including geographically), and otherwise legally compliant rest
17 periods for every shift lasting three and one-half (3.5) to six (6) hours and/or two full, uninterrupted,
18 off-duty and otherwise legally compliant rest periods for every shift lasting six (6) to ten (10) hours,
19 and/or three full, uninterrupted, off-duty and otherwise legally compliant rest periods for every shift
20 lasting ten (10) hour to fourteen (14) hours, and failed to make a good faith effort to authorize, permit,
21 and provide such rest breaks in the middle of each work period.

22 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
23 should have known that Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members were entitled to receive
24 all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other class and subclass
25 members' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, shortened, late, interrupted, on-duty,
26 restricted to the premises and/or otherwise not compliant with the requirements of applicable
27 California law, and they did not receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at
28

1 Plaintiff's and the other class and subclass members' regular rate of pay when a rest period was not
2 compliant with California law.

3 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
4 should have known that Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members were entitled to receive at
5 least minimum wages for compensation and that they were not receiving at least minimum wages for
6 all hours worked. Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages included, *inter alia*, Defendants'
7 effective payment of zero dollars per hour for hours Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members
8 worked off the clock performing work duties, including (but not limited to) duties such as those
9 described in Paragraph 26 above.

10 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
11 should have known that Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members were entitled to receive
12 complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but, in fact, they did not
13 receive complete and accurate wage statements from Defendants. The deficiencies included, *inter*
14 *alia*, the failure to include (i) the accurate total number of hours worked by Plaintiff and the other
15 class and subclass members; (ii) the accurate and applicable rates of pay in effect during each pay
16 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; (iii) the accurate gross
17 wages and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned for hours worked,
18 correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance
19 with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted in accordance
20 with California law, and correct sick pay wages); and (iv) complete and correct deductions.
21 Defendants also failed to keep complete and accurate employment and payroll records for Plaintiff
22 and the other class and subclass members in accordance with California law, including Cal. Lab. Code
23 §§ 226(a), 1174(d), and the IWC Wage Orders.

24 36. Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d) provides, the requirements of this section shall be deemed
25 satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid
26 not more than seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Cal. Lab. Code § 210
27 provides:

28 [I]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided

1 in this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided
2 in Sections. . . 204. . . shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial
3 violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee; (2) For
4 each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars
5 (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully
6 withheld.

7 37. Defendants from time to time failed to pay Plaintiff and other class and subclass
8 members within seven (7) days of the close of the payroll period in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code
9 § 204(d).

10 38. Defendants also underpaid sick pay wages to Plaintiff and other class and subclass
11 members, including by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay in violation of Cal. Lab.
12 Code § 246.

13 39. Cal. Lab. Code § 246(1)(2) requires that paid sick time for nonexempt employees be
14 calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the
15 employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

16 40. Defendants violated Cal. Lab. Code § 246 by failing to pay sick pay at the regular rate
17 of pay. Plaintiff and class and subclass members earned non-discretionary incentive wages which
18 increased their regular rate of pay. However, when sick pay was paid, it was paid at the base or
19 otherwise improper rate of pay for Plaintiff and class and subclass members, as opposed to the correct,
20 higher regular rate of pay, as required under Cal. Lab. Code § 246.

21 41. Additionally, as a pattern and practice, Defendants regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and
22 other class and subclass members their correct wages owed upon separation from Defendants'
23 employment (including sick pay wages) and accordingly owe waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal.
24 Lab. Code § 203. Further, Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that such
25 failure to pay sick pay at the regular rate was willful, such that Plaintiff and class and subclass
26 members whose employment has separated are entitled to waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab.
27 Code §§ 201-203.

1 42. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
2 should have known that Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members were entitled to
3 reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses, including (without limitation), expenses
4 related to the purchase and maintenance (including laundering) of various uniform items (including
5 but not limited to scrubs, shoes, and white jeans), expenses related to complying with Defendants'
6 dress code and grooming policies, and personal cell phone expenses (which were used for work
7 purposes).

8 43. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to
9 compensate and reimburse Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members pursuant to California
10 law, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation and reimbursement, but
11 willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely represented to Plaintiff and the
12 other class and subclass members that they were properly paid all wages and reimbursements, all in
13 order to increase Defendants' profits.

14 44. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff
15 and the other class and subclass members for all overtime hours worked. Plaintiff and the other class
16 and subclass members were required to work more than eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours
17 per week without overtime compensation for all overtime hours worked.

18 45. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to provide all requisite, legally
19 compliant meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members.

20 46. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class
21 and subclass members at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

22 47. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay all sick pay wages to Plaintiff
23 and the other class and subclass members in accordance with California law.

24 48. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class
25 and subclass members all wages owed to them during their employment and/or upon discharge or
26 resignation.

27 49. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to provide complete or accurate
28 wage statements to Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members.

1 50. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to keep complete and accurate
2 employment and payroll records for Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members in accordance
3 with California law, including Cal. Lab. Code § 1174(d).

4 51. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other
5 class and subclass members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs.

6 52. As a result of the above facts, during the relevant time period, Defendants were and
7 continue to be in violation of the California Labor Code, including §§ 98.1, 200-204, 210, 216, 218.5,
8 218.6, 221, 223-224, 225.5, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 233, 245-247, 249, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1174, 1174.5,
9 1175, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802, the applicable IWC Wage Orders
10 related to these claims arising under the California Labor Code, the California Business and
11 Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, the California Civil Code §§ 3287, 3336 and 3294, the California
12 Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11000 *et seq.* and Title 12, §§ 11040 *et seq.*; and California Code
13 of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, seeking unpaid or incorrectly paid wages and compensation, unpaid meal
14 and rest period compensation, unreimbursed expenses, penalties, liquidated damages, interest,
15 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, and other relief.

16 53. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to properly compensate Plaintiff
17 and the other class and subclass members pursuant to California law in order to increase Defendants'
18 profits. California Labor Code § 218 states that nothing in Article 1 of the Labor Code shall limit the
19 right of any wage claimant to "sue directly . . . for any wages or penalty due to him [or her] under this
20 article."

21 54. All of the conduct and violations alleged herein occurred during the class period.

22 55. Defendants' illegal policies and practices were applied to Plaintiff and the other class
23 and subclass members, and were in effect throughout the class period.

24 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

25 56. Plaintiff brings this action on her own behalf and on behalf of each and all other
26 persons similarly situated, and thus, seeks class certification under California Code of Civil Procedure
27 § 382.
28

1 57. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief
2 authorized by California law.

3 58. The proposed Class is defined as follows:

4 All persons who worked for any Defendant in California as an hourly, non-exempt
5 employee at any time during the period beginning four (4) years before the filing of the
6 initial complaint in this action to final judgment.

7 59. Plaintiff also seeks to represent subclasses included in Plaintiff's class, including the
8 following:

- 9 a. All class members who were not paid at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
- 10 b. All class members who were not properly or accurately paid all overtime wages
11 owed (including, but not limited to, at their "regular rate of pay" for overtime
12 compensation) for hours worked over 8 in a day or 40 in a workweek;
- 13 c. All class members who worked more than 5 hours in a workday and were not
14 provided with a timely, uninterrupted, duty-free, and otherwise lawful meal period
15 of 30 minutes, and were not paid compensation of 1-hour of premium wages at the
16 employee's regular rate in lieu thereof;
- 17 d. All class members who worked more than 10 hours in a workday and were not
18 provided with a timely, uninterrupted, duty-free and otherwise lawful second meal
19 period of 30 minutes, and were not paid compensation of 1-hour of premium wages
20 at the employee's regular rate in lieu thereof;
- 21 e. All class members who worked more than 3.5 hours in a workday and were not
22 authorized or permitted to take a 10-minute uninterrupted, duty-free and otherwise
23 lawful rest period for every 4 hours or major fraction thereof worked per day and
24 were not paid compensation of 1-hour of premium wages at the employee's regular
25 rate in lieu thereof;
- 26 f. All class members who were not reimbursed for all necessary business
27 expenditures;
- 28 g. All class members who were not accurately paid for sick pay;
- h. All class members who did not timely receive all wages and compensation when
 due;
- i. All class members who did not receive all wages and compensation owed at time of
 separation or within 72 hours in the case of resignation;
- j. All class members who were not provided with accurate and complete itemized
 wage statements;

1 k. All class members whose records were not properly and accurately maintained/kept
2 (including employment, pay, and time records); and

3 l. All class members who were subjected to Defendants' unfair business practices.

4 60. Plaintiff reserves the right, including under California Rule of Court 3.765, to amend
5 or modify the descriptions of the Class and/or subclasses as appropriate (including to further divide
6 the Class Members into additional subclasses) and/or to add additional subclasses. Any reference
7 herein to the Class Members or Plaintiff's Class includes the members of each of the subclasses.

8 61. At all material times, Plaintiff was a member of the Class.

9 62. Plaintiff undertakes this concerted activity to improve the wages and working
10 conditions of all Class Members.

11 63. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation, and the Class is readily
12 ascertainable:

13 a. Numerosity: The Class and subclass members are so numerous that joinder of all
14 members would be unfeasible and impractical. The membership of the entire Class
15 and classes is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, upon information and
16 belief, the Class and each of the subclasses is estimated to be greater than fifty (50)
17 individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by
18 inspection of Defendants' employment records.

19 b. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of all other Class and subclass members
20 as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of
21 the other Class and subclass members with whom they have a well-defined
22 community of interest.

23 c. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class
24 and subclass member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of
25 interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no conflicts
26 with or interests antagonistic to any Class and subclass members. Plaintiff's
27 attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are competent and versed in the rules
28 governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has

1 incurred, and during the pendency of this action, will continue to incur, costs and
2 attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the
3 prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class and subclass
4 member.

5 d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and
6 efficient adjudication of this litigation, including because joinder of all Class and
7 subclass members is impractical.

8 e. Public Policy Considerations: The public policy of the State of California is to
9 resolve the California Labor Code claims of many employees through a class
10 action. Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will advance public policy
11 objectives. Employers of this great state violate employment and labor laws every
12 day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct
13 and indirect retaliation. And former employees are fearful of bringing actions
14 because they believe their former employers might damage their future endeavors
15 through negative references and/or other means. However, class actions provide
16 the class and subclass members who are not named in the complaint with a type of
17 anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights at the same time as their
18 privacy is protected.

19 64. There are common questions of law and fact as to the class and subclass members that
20 predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The following common questions of
21 law or fact, among others, exist as to the members of the class/subclasses:

- 22 a. Whether Defendants unlawfully failed to correctly calculate and pay overtime,
23 regular, minimum, premium, and sick wages, and other compensation due to class
24 and subclass members;
- 25 b. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages or other compensation, without
26 abatement or reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;
- 27 c. Whether Defendants had a corporate policy and practice of failing to pay their
28 hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California for all hours

1 worked and missed (short, late, restricted, interrupted, and/or missed altogether)
2 meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law;

3 d. Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members
4 to work over eight (8) hours per day and/or over forty (40) hours per week and
5 failed to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiff and the other
6 class and subclass members;

7 e. Whether Defendants failed to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff and the other class
8 and subclass members for all overtime hours worked, or failed to pay such overtime
9 wages at the correct “regular rate”;

10 f. Whether Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class and subclass
11 members double time for all hours worked in excess of 12 hours in a day or for
12 work over 8 hours in a day on the seventh day of work in a workweek;

13 g. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members
14 of legally compliant meal and/or rest breaks by, among other things, failing to
15 provide them timely, uninterrupted breaks, and/or requiring them to perform any
16 work during such breaks, and/or requiring them to remain on the premises for such
17 breaks;

18 h. Whether Defendants failed to pay regular and minimum wages to Plaintiff and the
19 other class and subclass members for all hours worked;

20 i. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other class and
21 subclass members within the required time during their employment and/or upon
22 their discharge or resignation;

23 j. Whether Defendants provided accurate itemized wage statements, wage reporting,
24 and records maintenance as required by the California Labor Code; including, *inter*
25 *alia*, sections 226 and 1174;

26 k. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class and subclass
27 members for necessary business-related expenses and costs;

28 l. Whether Defendants’ conduct was intentional, willful or reckless;

- m. Whether Defendants' policies, practices, or procedures were illegal;
- n. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;
- o. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and
- p. Whether Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

65. In addition to meeting the statutory pre-requisites to a class action, this action is properly maintained as a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382, in that:

- a. Without class certification, and determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory and other legal questions with the class format, the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the class and/or subclasses will create a risk of:
 - i. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class and/or subclasses which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the class; and/or
 - ii. Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including but not limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants.
- b. The parties opposing the class have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the class making appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the class and/or subclasses as a whole in that Defendants failed to pay all wages due to members of the class as required by law.
 - i. With respect to the unfair business practices act claim, the final relief on behalf of the class and/or subclass sought does not relate exclusively to restitution because through this claim Plaintiff seeks declaratory relief

1 holding that the Defendants' policy and practices constitute unfair
2 competition, along with declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and incidental
3 equitable relief as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct
4 declared to constitute unfair competition

5 c. Common questions of law and fact exist as to the members of the class and
6 subclasses, with respect to the practices and violations of California law as listed
7 herein, and predominate over any question affecting only individual class and/or
8 subclass members, and a class action is superior to other available methods for the
9 fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

10 i. The interests of the members of the class and/or subclasses in individually
11 controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions in that the
12 substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to recover the
13 relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the individual class
14 and/or subclass members when compared to the substantial expense and
15 burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;

16 ii. Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation that
17 would create the risk of:

18 a. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members
19 of the class and/or subclasses, which would establish incompatible
20 standards of conduct for the Defendants; and/or

21 b. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the class and/or
22 subclasses would as a practical matter be dispositive of the interests of
23 the other members not parties to the adjudication or substantially impair
24 or impede their ability to protect their interests;

25 iii. In the context of wage litigation, because a substantial number of individual
26 class and subclass members will avoid asserting their legal rights out of fear
27 of retaliation by Defendants, which may adversely affect an individual's job
28

1 with Defendants or with a subsequent employer, the class action is the only
2 means to assert their claims through a representative; and

3 iv. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient
4 adjudication of this litigation because class treatment will obviate the need
5 for unduly and unnecessary duplicative litigation that is likely to result in the
6 absence of certification of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. §
7 382

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

15 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198**

17 *(Against all Defendants)*

18 67. Plaintiff incorporates herein by this reference all paragraphs above as though fully set
19 forth herein.

20 68. California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage
21 Order(s) provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay
22 either time-and-one-half or two-times that person's regular rate of pay, depending on the number of
23 hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

24 69. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and were
25 required to pay Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members employed by Defendants, and
26 working more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, at the rate
27 of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40)
28 hours in a workweek.

1 70. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants are and were
2 required to pay Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members overtime compensation at a rate of
3 two times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day.

4 71. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants are and were
5 required to pay Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members overtime compensation at a rate of
6 two times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day.

7 72. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public
8 policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.

9 73. California Labor Code § 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-and-
10 one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty
11 (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work, and to overtime
12 compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a
13 day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day of work.

14 74. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members
15 were required, permitted, or suffered by Defendants to work for Defendants in excess of eight (8)
16 hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a week, including performing work duties off-
17 the-clock.

18 75. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to
19 properly pay overtime wages owed to Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members. Plaintiff
20 and the other class and subclass members did not receive overtime compensation at one and one-half
21 times their regular hourly rate of pay for all hours spent performing job duties in excess of eight (8)
22 hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day
23 of work. They also did not receive overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours
24 worked in excess of twelve (12) hours worked in a day.

25 76. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, Defendants also
26 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by Plaintiff
27 and other class and subclass members, including by failing to incorporate all forms of compensation
28 into the regular rate of pay.

77. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and other class and subclass members have been paid less for overtime worked than they are entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

78. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members the unpaid balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

79. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 1194, 218.5, and 218.6, Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members are entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 and 512

(Against all Defendants)

80. Plaintiff incorporates herein by this reference all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

81. At all relevant times, the IWC Order and California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiff's and the other class and subclass members' employment by Defendants.

82. At all relevant times, California Labor Code § 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

83. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code § 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee.

84. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code § 512(a) further provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second

1 uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total hours worked is
2 no more than twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the
3 employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

4 85. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members who were
5 scheduled to work for a period of more than five (5) hours, and who did not waive their legally-
6 mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than five (5)
7 hours without an uninterrupted off-duty meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

8 86. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members'
9 meal periods were missed, shortened, taken late, restricted to Defendants' premises, interrupted and/or
10 otherwise noncompliant with California law, as alleged herein.

11 87. As a result, Defendants failed to relieve Plaintiff and the other class and subclass
12 members of all duties, failed to relinquish control over Plaintiff and the other class and subclass
13 members' activities, failed to permit Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members a reasonable
14 opportunity to take, and impeded or discouraged them from taking thirty (30) minute uninterrupted
15 meal periods no later than the end of their fifth hour of work for shifts lasting more than five (5) hours,
16 and/or to take second thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal periods no later than their tenth hour of
17 work for shifts lasting more than ten (10) hours (or twelve hours).

18 88. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully required
19 Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members to work during meal periods and failed to
20 compensate Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members the full meal period premium for work
21 performed during meal periods.

22 89. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class
23 and subclass members their proper and full meal period premiums due pursuant to California Labor
24 Code § 226.7.

25 90. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code
26 §§ 226.7 and 512.

27 91. Pursuant to applicable IWC Wage Order, California Labor Code §§ 218.6, 226.7(c),
28 and 512, and California Civil Code § 3287, Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members are

1 entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
2 compensation for each work day that the meal or rest period is not provided, as well as interest,
3 penalties, expenses, and costs of suit.

4 92. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5 and 218.6, Plaintiff and the other class and
5 subclass members are also entitled to recover attorney's fees and costs.

6 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7**

8 *(Against all Defendants)*

9 93. Plaintiff incorporates herein by this reference all paragraphs above as though fully set
10 forth herein.

11 94. At all times herein set forth, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor
12 Code § 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiff's and the other class and subclass members' employment
13 by Defendants.

14 95. At all relevant times, California Labor Code § 226.7 provides that no employer shall
15 require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California
16 IWC.

17 96. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that "[e]very employer
18 shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in
19 the middle of each work period" and that the "rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked
20 daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof" unless
21 the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3 ½) hours.

22 97. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and other class and
23 subclass members to work three and one-half (3½) or more hours without authorizing or permitting
24 an off-duty, net ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period, or major fraction thereof,
25 worked.

26 98. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members'
27 rest periods were missed, shortened, late, interrupted, improperly restricted to Defendants' premises
28 and/or otherwise noncompliant with California law as alleged herein. Defendants failed to authorize

1 or permit Plaintiffs and the other class and subclass members or failed to relinquish control over
2 Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members' activities in order to take full, uninterrupted, off-
3 duty, or otherwise compliant rest periods for every shift lasting three and one-half (3½) to six (6)
4 hours and/or two full, uninterrupted, off-duty, or otherwise compliant rest periods for every shift
5 lasting six (6) to ten (10) hours, and/or three full, uninterrupted, off-duty, or otherwise compliant rest
6 periods for every shift lasting ten (10) to fourteen (14) hours, and failed to make a good faith effort to
7 authorize, permit, and provide such rest breaks in the middle of each work period.

8 99. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to provide Plaintiff and
9 the other class and subclass members with legally compliant rest periods and failed to pay Plaintiff
10 and the other class and subclass members their proper and full rest period premium due pursuant to
11 California Labor Code § 226.7.

12 100. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code
13 § 226.7.

14 101. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code §§ 218.6 and
15 226.7(c), and California Civil Code § 3287, Plaintiffs and the other class and subclass members are
16 entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at the employees' regular hourly rate
17 of compensation for each work day that the rest period was not provided, as well as interest, penalties,
18 expenses, and costs of suit.

19 102. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5 and 218.6, Plaintiff and the other class and
20 subclass members are also entitled to recover attorney's fees and costs.

21 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1**

23 *(Against all Defendants)*

24 103. Plaintiff incorporates herein by this reference all paragraphs above as though fully set
25 forth herein.

26 104. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public
27 policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.
28

1 105. At all relevant times, California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1182.12
2 provided the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and that payment of a lesser wage than the
3 minimum so fixed is unlawful.

4 106. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1198, it is unlawful to employ persons for longer than hours
5 set by the IWC or under conditions prohibited by the IWC Wage Order(s). Pursuant to Labor Code
6 §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a), an employee who has not been paid the legal minimum wage may recover
7 the unpaid balance, together with attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages.

8 107. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay minimum wage to Plaintiff
9 and the other class and subclass members as required, pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 1182.12,
10 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages included, *inter alia*, Defendants'
11 effective payment of zero dollars per hour for time Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members
12 worked off the clock, as alleged herein.

13 108. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members the
14 minimum wage as required violates California Labor Code, including §§ 204, 210, 216, 558, 1182.12,
15 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and the applicable Wage Order(s). Pursuant to those sections,
16 Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their
17 minimum wage compensation as well as interest, costs (including statutory costs), penalties,
18 attorney's fees, and liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and
19 interest thereon.

20 109. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1197.1, Plaintiff and the other class and subclass
21 members are entitled to recover a penalty of \$100.00 for the initial failure to timely pay each employee
22 minimum wages, and \$250.00 for each subsequent failure to pay each employee minimum wages.

23 110. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194.2, Plaintiff and the other class and subclass
24 members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully
25 unpaid and interest thereon.

26 111. Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members are also entitled to seek recovery of
27 attorney's fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5 and 218.6.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California Labor Code – Failure to Timely Pay Wages

(Against all Defendants)

112. Plaintiff incorporates herein by this reference all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

113. The California Labor Code provides various time limits by when an employer must pay its employees all wages due and owing to them.

114. For example, Labor Code § 204 requires that earned wages are due and payable twice in each calendar month. Accordingly, wages required by Labor Code §§ 226.7, 510, 1194, 346, 351, and other sections identified herein (and in the applicable Wage Orders) became due and payable to each employee twice in each month that he or she earned such wages, including for overtime and minimum wages, meal/rest period premiums, and sick pay. Defendants violated Labor Code § 204 by systematically refusing to timely pay such wages when due during Plaintiff's and the class and subclass members' employment.

115. Labor Code § 210(a) provides that "[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3, 204, 204b, 204.1, 204.2, 204.11, 205, 205.5, and 1197.5, shall be subject to a penalt[ies]."

116. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff and other class and subclass members have been deprived of wages in amounts to be determined at trial, and are entitled to recovery of such amounts, penalties, plus interest thereon, attorneys' fees, and costs, including pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 218.5, 218.6, 510, and 1194.

117. Further, at all relevant times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 200, 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 if an employee quits 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' 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.

118. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members who were discharged, or who provided at least seventy-two (72) hours' notice of their intention to quit, their wages, earned and unpaid, immediately at the time of their discharge or separation (including, without limitation, overtime and minimum wages, meal/rest period premiums, and sick pay).

119. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ (including, without limitation, overtime and minimum wages, meal/rest period premiums, and sick pay).

120. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, either immediately or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

121. California 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 from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

122. Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members are entitled to recover from Defendants the statutory penalty wages for each day they were not paid, up to a thirty (30) day maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

123. Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members are also entitled to seek recovery of attorney's fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5 and 218.6.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1174

(Against all Defendants)

124. Plaintiff incorporates herein by this reference all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

1 125. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that
2 every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized statement in writing
3 showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate
4 units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all
5 deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated
6 and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the
7 employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name
8 and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during
9 the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.
10 The deductions made from payments of wages shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form,
11 properly dated, showing the month, day, and year, and a copy of the statement or a record of the
12 deductions shall be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of employment or
13 at a central location within the State of California.

14 126. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the other
15 class and subclass members with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include
16 the requirements listed in Section 226 *et al.* By way of examples only, Defendants' wage statements
17 failed to include regular time and overtime spent by Plaintiff and the members of the class or
18 subclasses performing off-the-clock work, all wages earned/owed for such time, all meal and/or rest
19 period premiums owed, the proper rate of pay for all hours worked, meal/rest period premiums and/or
20 sick pay wages, and the proper gross and net wages earned (including at the correct rates). Defendants
21 had the information necessary to provide wage statements that accurately reflected the above
22 information, yet failed to do so on a systematic basis and instead provided legally noncompliant wage
23 statements.

24 127. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and
25 the other class and subclass members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected
26 rights. Because Plaintiff and the other putative class and subclass members' wage statements did not
27 reflect, among other things, the accurate number of hours worked, Plaintiff and the putative class and
28 subclass members were unable to determine the total amount of regular and overtime hours they

1 worked, were unable to determine the total amount of compensation they were owed, and were unable
2 to verify they were paid the proper amounts. In order to determine how much Plaintiff and the other
3 putative class and subclass members should have been paid, Plaintiff and the other putative class and
4 subclass members would have had to engage in discovery and mathematical computations in order to
5 reconstruct the missing information. Thus, Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members have
6 been injured by Defendants' intentional and knowing violation of California Labor Code § 226(a).

7 128. The applicable IWC Wage Order(s), Cal. Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1174.5 also
8 require Defendants to maintain and preserve, among other items, complete and accurate employment
9 records (including showing the names and addresses of all employees employed, start and end of
10 shifts, time records (including when the employee begins and ends each work period), payroll records,
11 employee schedules, meal periods, split shift intervals, total daily hours worked, total hours worked
12 in the payroll period, applicable rates of pay, and wages paid). Defendants have knowingly and
13 intentionally failed to comply with the Wage Order(s), and California Labor Code § 1174 relating to
14 Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members, including by implementing policies and
15 procedures and committing the violations alleged herein. Defendants' failure to comply with these
16 laws is also an unfair business activity, including pursuant to Labor Code § 1175.

17 129. Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members are entitled to recover from
18 Defendants their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code
19 § 226(a), and/or any associated penalties or liquidated damages.

20 130. Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members are also entitled to damages and
21 statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1174.5, and civil penalties pursuant
22 to Labor Code § 226.3, and other applicable provisions.

23 131. Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members are also entitled to attorney's fees
24 and costs pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e).

25 132. Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members are also entitled to injunctive relief,
26 as well as an award of attorney's fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to
27 California Labor Code § 226(h).

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802**

3 *(Against all Defendants)*

4 133. Plaintiff incorporates herein by this reference all paragraphs above as though fully set
5 forth herein.

6 134. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802, an employer must reimburse its
7 employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the
8 discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of
9 the employer.

10 135. Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members incurred necessary business-related
11 expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants, including, but not limited to,
12 purchasing, cleaning and/or maintaining work uniforms on behalf of and for the benefit of Defendants,
13 amounts incurred in complying with Defendants' dress code and grooming policies, and costs related
14 to using personal cell phones for business-related purposes.

15 136. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other
16 class and subclass members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs.

17 137. Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members are entitled to recover from
18 Defendants their business-related expenses and costs incurred during the course and scope of their
19 employment, plus interest accrued from the date on which the employee incurred the necessary
20 expenditures at the same rate as judgments in civil actions in the State of California.

21 138. Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members are also entitled to attorney's fees,
22 expenses, costs of suit, and interest pursuant to California Labor Code § 2802.

23 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201-204, 233 and 246 (Sick Pay Violations)**

25 *(Against all Defendants)*

26 139. Plaintiff incorporates herein by this reference all paragraphs above as though fully set
27 forth herein.

1 140. Cal. Lab. Code § 233 provides that an employer must permit an employee to use
2 accrued sick leave in accordance with Cal Lab. Code § 246.5 at the employee's then current rate of
3 entitlement. Cal. Lab. Code § 246 provides that an employee is entitled to sick pay wages for use of
4 accrued sick leave pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 246.5. Specifically, once accrued sick leave is used
5 as paid sick time, an employee has a vested right to sick pay wages, which an employer must calculate
6 and compensate based on one of two calculations: (i) "Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall
7 be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee
8 uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek," or (ii)
9 "Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated by dividing the employee's total wages,
10 not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of
11 the prior 90 days of employment." Under Cal. Lab. Code §§ 218 and 233, employees may sue to
12 recover unpaid or underpaid sick pay wages as damages. A violation of these requirements is
13 actionable pursuant to the California Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code 17200 *et seq.*

14 141. As a matter of policy and practice, Defendants calculate sick pay at the incorrect rate.
15 Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members regularly use accrued sick leave in the workweeks
16 in which they also earn non-hourly remuneration. As a matter of policy and practice, Defendants pay
17 sick pay to Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members at the base (or other improper or
18 inaccurate) hourly pay, as opposed to the regular rate of pay, which would consider all non-hourly
19 remuneration in addition to base hourly wages, or the rate resulting from dividing the employee's total
20 wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay
21 periods of the prior 90 days of employment. As a result, Defendants either did not pay, or underpaid
22 sick pay wages to Plaintiff and the class and subclass members.

23 142. Cal. Lab. Code § 204 provides that wages generally are due and payable twice during
24 each calendar month and are to be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period.
25 Consistent with Cal. Lab. Code § 204, Cal. Lab. Code § 246 specifically requires that, upon use of
26 accrued sick leave, vested sick pay wages are due and to be paid no later than the payday for the next
27 regular payroll period after accrued sick leave is used as paid sick time. Similarly, Cal. Lab. Code §
28 201 provides that if an employer discharges an employee, wages earned and unpaid at the time of

1 discharge are due and payable immediately. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides that an employee is
2 entitled to receive all unpaid wages no later than 72 hours after an employee quits his or her
3 employment, unless the employee has given 72-hour notice of his or her intention to quit, in which
4 case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. The Labor Code penalizes
5 untimely payments. For example, Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails
6 to pay wages owed in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-202, then the wages of the employee
7 shall continue as a penalty from the due date, and at the same rate until paid, but the wages shall not
8 continue for more than thirty (30) days. Likewise, Cal. Lab. Code § 210 provides penalties for
9 violations of Cal. Lab. Code § 204 and untimely payments during employment. Under Cal. Lab. Code
10 §§ 210 and 218, employees may sue to recover applicable penalties. As alleged herein and as a matter
11 of policy and practice, Defendants routinely did not pay or underpay sick pay wages in violation of
12 Labor Code §§ 233 and 246. Moreover, as alleged above, this non-payment and/or underpayment
13 also violates Section 210, among other Labor Code provisions, because Defendants fail to timely pay
14 all such wages when owed both during employment and at separation of same.

15 143. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants knew, or should have known, of the
16 mandates of the Labor Code as it relates to Plaintiff's allegations, especially since the California
17 Supreme Court has explained that "[c]ourts have recognized that 'wages' also include those benefits
18 to which an employee is entitled as a part of his or her compensation, including money, room, board,
19 clothing, vacation pay, and sick pay." *Murphy v. Kenneth Cole Prods., Inc.*, 40 Cal. 4th 1094, 1103
20 (2007). Because Defendants willfully fail to timely pay Plaintiff and the class and subclass members
21 all sick pay wages due, Defendants are subject to applicable penalties.

22 144. Such a pattern, practice, and uniform administration of corporate policy is unlawful
23 and entitles Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members to underpaid sick pay wages, including
24 interest thereon, applicable penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit.

1 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 et seq.**

3 *(Against all Defendants)*

4 145. Plaintiff incorporates herein by this reference all paragraphs above as though fully set
5 forth herein.

6 146. Defendants, and each of them, are “persons” as defined under California Business &
7 Professions Code § 17201.

8 147. California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”) defines unfair
9 competition as any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice.

10 148. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
11 unlawful, fraudulent, and harmful to Plaintiff, other class and subclass members, to the general
12 public, and to Defendants’ competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights
13 affecting the public interest within the meaning of the California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

14 149. Defendants’ activities as alleged herein are violations of California law, and
15 constitute unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business acts or practices in violation of California
16 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* Section 17203 authorizes injunctive, declaratory,
17 and/or other equitable relief with respect to unfair competition as follows:

18 Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair
19 competition may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction.
20 The court may make such orders or judgments, including the
21 appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to prevent the use or
22 employment by any person of any practice which constitutes unfair
23 competition, as defined in this chapter, or as may be necessary to restore
24 to any person in interest any money or property, real or personal, which
25 may have been acquired by means of such unfair competition.
26 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203.

27 150. By the conduct alleged herein, Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in
28 business practices which violate California law, including but not limited to, the applicable IWC Wage
Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code, including, but not limited
to, §§ 98.1, 200-204, 210, 216, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 223-224, 225.5, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 233, 245-247,
249, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1175, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and

1 2802, for which this Court should issue declaratory, injunctive, and other equitable relief pursuant to
2 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to
3 constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

4 151. By the conduct alleged herein, Defendants' practices were unlawful, unfair, deceptive,
5 and fraudulent in that these practices violate public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive,
6 unscrupulous or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or utility
7 for which this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section 17203 of the
8 California Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages and compensation wrongfully
9 withheld.

10 152. By the conduct alleged herein, Defendants' practices were deceptive and fraudulent in
11 that Defendants' policy and practice failed to provide the legally mandated meal and rest periods, the
12 required amount of compensation for missed meal and rest periods and overtime, overtime, minimum,
13 and sick wages owed, failed to timely pay wages, and failed to reimburse all necessary business
14 expenses incurred, and failed to provide overtime wages due for overtime worked as a result of failing
15 to include non-discretionary incentive compensation into their regular rates of pay for purposes of
16 computing the proper overtime pay due to business practices that cannot be justified, pursuant to the
17 applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and IWC requirements in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*,
18 and for which this Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof.
19 Code § 17203, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

20 153. By the conduct alleged herein, Defendants' practices were also unlawful, unfair and
21 deceptive in that Defendants' employment practices caused Plaintiff and the other class and subclass
22 members to be underpaid.

23 154. By the conduct alleged herein, Defendants' practices were also unlawful, unfair and
24 deceptive in that Defendants' policies, practices and procedures failed to provide all legally required
25 meal/rest breaks to Plaintiff and other class and subclass members as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§
26 226.7 and 512, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

155. Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members have been personally injured by Defendants' unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not necessarily limited to the loss of money and/or property.

156. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during the class period; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

157. Plaintiffs and the other class and subclass members are further entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the described business practices are unlawful, unfair and deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining Defendants from engaging in any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

Class Certification

1. That this action be certified as a class action;
2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the class and subclasses; and
3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

As to the First Cause of Action

4. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the applicable California Labor Code sections and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due to Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members;
5. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

6. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
7. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest incurred; and
8. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Second Cause of Action

9. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the applicable California Labor Code sections and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all meal periods, or compensation in lieu thereof, to Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members;
10. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not provided;
11. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
12. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(c);
13. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;
14. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest incurred; and
15. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Third Cause of Action

16. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the applicable California Labor Code sections and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all rest periods, or compensation in lieu thereof, to Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members;
17. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not provided;
18. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
19. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(c);
20. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

- 1 21. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest incurred; and
2 22. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

3 As to the Fourth Cause of Action

- 4 23. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the applicable
5 California Labor Code sections by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff
6 and the other class and subclass members;
7 24. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;
8 25. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 1197.1 for Plaintiff
9 and the other class and subclass members in the amount as may be established
10 according to proof at trial;
11 26. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts
12 were due;
13 27. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest incurred;
14 28. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194.2; and
15 29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

16 As to the Fifth Cause of Action

- 17 30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the applicable
18 California Labor Code sections by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed
19 during employment to Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members;
20 31. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;
21 32. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
22 33. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts
23 were due;
24 34. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest incurred; and
25 35. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

26 As to the Sixth Cause of Action

- 27 36. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping
28 provisions of the applicable California Labor Code sections, including sections 226(a)

and 1174, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders as to Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto and failed to maintain appropriate records;

- 37. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
- 38. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);
- 39. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, including pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h); and
- 40. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

- 41. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class and subclass members for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802;
- 42. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
- 43. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;
- 44. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest incurred herein; and
- 45. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

- 46. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the applicable California Labor Code sections by willfully failing to pay all sick pay wages;
- 47. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory damages due to Plaintiff and the class and subclass members;
- 48. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
- 49. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;
- 50. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest incurred herein; and
- 51. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

52. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* for the reasons identified herein.
53. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all the other class and subclass members and all pre-judgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;
54. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a result of violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;
55. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5;
56. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and
57. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to all Causes of Action

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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of other employees similarly situated, demands a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury.

Date: November 12, 2025

KV LAW, P.C.

/s/ Kristapor Vartanian

By: _____

Kristapor Vartanian
Attorney for Plaintiff

KV LAW, P.C.

KRISTAPOR VARTANIAN
DIRECT DIAL: (213) 799-3734
E-MAIL: kvartanian@kvlawpc.com

January 7, 2026

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Ararat Home of Los Angeles, Inc.
Attn: Derik G. Ghookasian
15105 Mission Hills Road
Mission Hills, California 91345

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

California Labor & Workforce Development
Agency ("LWDA")
(<https://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html>)

Re: AMENDED NOTICE PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE §§ 2698, *et seq.*

To Whom It May Concern:

Our office has been retained to represent plaintiff Shahla Karimi ("Plaintiff") and the Aggrieved Employees (defined below) against Ararat Home of Los Angeles, Inc. (the "Company") for violations of California wage-and-hour laws.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the Aggrieved Employees, gives notice to commence and/or amend a civil action pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*

"Aggrieved Employees" refers to all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant in California as an hourly, non-exempt employee during the time period of November 12, 2024 until a date as determined by the Court. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from approximately 2016 until January 2025 as a non-exempt employee. Plaintiff contends that Defendant unlawfully failed (and fails) to pay all wages (including at the correct rate) during employment and upon termination -- including minimum wages, overtime wages, premium wages, and sick pay wages; failed (and fails) to provide uninterrupted and compliant meal periods; failed (and fails) to provide uninterrupted and compliant rest periods; failed (and fails) to indemnify necessary business expenses; failed (and fails) to furnish accurate itemized wage statements; failed (and fails) to keep accurate records, and required (and requires) illegal restrictive covenants. This conduct, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated complaint, violates California Labor Code §§ 200-204, 204b, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 232, 232.5, 233, 245-249, 432.5, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1175, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.5, 1198, 1198.5, 2800, 2802, and 2804, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and are therefore actionable under California Labor Code § 2699.3.

A copy of the complaint by Plaintiff against the Company, which (i) identifies the alleged violations; (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations; (iii) sets forth the people/entities, violations, events, actions, and the like to the extent known to Plaintiff; and (iv) sets forth the Company's illegal practices, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the LWDA of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the Agency's reference.

January 7, 2026

Page 2

Thus, Plaintiff hereby incorporates the allegations of the attached complaint into this Notice as if fully set forth herein.

This Notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a civil action against the Company as authorized by California Labor Code §§ 2699 *et seq.*

Your earliest response to this Notice is greatly appreciated. If the Agency has any questions or needs any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully,

KV LAW, P.C.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Kristapor Vartanian", is written over a horizontal line.

Kristapor Vartanian, Esq.

Enclosure

1 Kristapor Vartanian (SBN 275378)
kvartanian@kvlawpc.com
2 **KV LAW, P.C.**
11400 West Olympic Blvd. Suite 200 #2042
3 Los Angeles, CA 90064
Telephone: (213) 799-3730
4

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff
Shahla Karimi

6 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
7 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

8 SHAHLA KARIMI, on behalf of the general
public and the State of California as private
9 attorney general,

10 Plaintiff,

11 vs.

12 ARARAT HOME OF LOS ANGELES, INC., a
California nonprofit corporation; and DOES 1
13 through 10, inclusive;

14 Defendants.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CASE NO.

**PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT (“PAGA”) REPRESENTATIVE
ACTION COMPLAINT PURSUANT TO
LABOR CODE §§ 2698 *et seq.***

1 Plaintiff Shahla Karimi (“Plaintiff” or “Karimi”), on behalf of the people of the State of
2 California and as an “aggrieved employee” acting as a private attorney general under the Private
3 Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.* (“PAGA”) alleges, on
4 information and belief, except for her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal
5 knowledge, the following:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Ararat Home of Los Angeles, Inc, and Does 1
8 through 10 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for civil penalties under the PAGA stemming
9 from Defendants’ (i) failure to pay minimum wages; (ii) failure to pay overtime wages; (iii) failure to
10 provide uninterrupted and compliant meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof; (iv) failure to
11 provide uninterrupted and compliant rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof; (v) failure to
12 properly pay sick pay; (vi) failure to maintain accurate records; (vii) failure to timely pay wages during
13 employment and upon termination; (viii) failure to furnish accurate itemized wage statements; (ix)
14 failure to indemnify necessary business expenses; and (x) illegal restrictive covenants.

15 2. Plaintiff is not seeking general and/or special damages, restitution or other damages
16 other than civil penalties. That is, California has enacted PAGA to permit an individual to bring an
17 action on behalf of themselves and on behalf of others for PAGA penalties only, which is the precise
18 and sole nature of this action.

19 3. The “Aggrieved Employees” are:

- 20 a. For claims/theories associated with subsections (i)-(viii) in Paragraph 1: all current
21 and former employees who worked for Defendants in California as hourly, non-
22 exempt employees at any time from one year prior to the postmark date of the
23 initial PAGA notice through the date of trial.
- 24 b. For claims/theories associated with subsections (ix)-(x) in Paragraph 1: all current
25 and former employees who worked for Defendants in California at any time from
26 one year prior to the postmark date of the initial PAGA notice through the date of
27 trial.

1 4. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants seeking only to recover penalties for
2 Plaintiff, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees that worked for Defendants, and on behalf of the State
3 of California. Plaintiff does not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by
4 California Labor Code § 2699 at this time. To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for
5 wage violations, Plaintiff does not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those
6 violations, but simply penalties as permitted by California Labor Code § 2699, declaratory relief, and
7 injunctive relief for Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees as permitted by the PAGA.

8 5. Defendants own/owned and/or operate/operated an industry, business, and
9 establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. As such, and based upon
10 all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants are subject
11 to the California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Orders.

12 6. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a
13 systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 14 a. Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum wages,
15 overtime wages, premium wages, and sick pay wages, in compliance with the
16 California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;
- 17 b. Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in compliance
18 with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing to maintain accurate
19 records of all meal periods taken, restricted, interrupted, or missed, and failing to
20 pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period violation occurred;
- 21 c. Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free rest periods in compliance
22 with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, and failing to pay an
23 additional hour's pay for each workday a rest period violation occurred;
- 24 d. Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred;
- 25 e. Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, overtime wages, premium
26 wages, and sick pay wages due within the time period specified by California law;
- 27 f. Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked;

1 and the transactions, occurrences, breaches and/or violations that give rise to this lawsuit occurred
2 within Los Angeles County.

3 **PARTIES**

4 13. Plaintiff is a California resident who has worked for Defendants as an employee in Los
5 Angeles County, California, from approximately 2016 until approximately January 18, 2025.

6 14. The State of California, via the Labor and Workforce Development Agency
7 (“LWDA”), is the real party in interest in this action. (*Kim v. Reins Int’l Calif., Inc.*, 9 Cal. 5th 73, 81
8 (2020) (the “government entity on whose behalf the plaintiff files suit is always the real party in
9 interest.”).) To the extent permitted by law, including pursuant *Balderas v. Fresh Start Harvesting,*
10 *Inc.*, 101 Cal. App. 5th 533 (2024) and *Rodriguez v. Packers Sanitation Servs. Ltd.*, 109 Cal. App. 5th
11 69 (2025), the PAGA claim is brought exclusively as a representative action and does not include
12 arbitrable claims.

13 15. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new plaintiffs,
14 if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *Hutcheson v. Superior Court*,
15 74 Cal. App. 5th 923 (2022), *La Sala v. Am. Savings and Loan Ass’n*, 5 Cal.3d 864, 872 (1971), and
16 other applicable law.

17 16. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based upon that information and belief alleges,
18 that Ararat Home of Los Angeles, Inc. is:

- 19 a. A California nonprofit corporation, with its principal places of business in Los
20 Angeles County, California.
- 21 b. A business entity conducting business in the State of California, including in Los
22 Angeles County.
- 23 c. The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer of the
24 Aggrieved Employees. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the
25 Aggrieved Employees to work and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working
26 conditions.
- 27 d. At all times alleged herein, Defendants are and were the employers of Plaintiff and
28 the Aggrieved Employees.

17. Plaintiff does not currently know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

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

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

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

20. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants in Los Angeles County, California, during the statutory period. During the statutory period, Defendants classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from California's overtime requirements, and paid Plaintiff an hourly wage.

21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours worked (including minimum wages, overtime wages, and premium wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with

1 uninterrupted and compliant meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof, failed to provide Plaintiff
2 with uninterrupted and compliant rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof, failed to pay at the
3 regular rate of pay when required, failed to maintain accurate records, failed to indemnify Plaintiff for
4 necessary business expenses, failed to timely and properly pay all wages to Plaintiff (including at
5 termination), and failed to furnish accurate wage statements. Plaintiff's experience working for
6 Defendants was typical and illustrative.

7 22. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
8 Employees, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees'
9 employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

10 23. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's
11 and the Aggrieved Employees' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and the other
12 Aggrieved Employees.

13 24. Defendants directly hired and paid wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

14 25. Throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, from time
15 to time, worked over eight (8) hours in a day, and/or forty (40) hours in a week during their
16 employment with Defendants, and were not properly paid all overtime.

17 26. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not
18 paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime and
19 minimum wages. Throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were
20 required to work off-the-clock, and uncompensated. Among other things, Defendants required
21 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to work while clocked out during what is supposed to be
22 their off-duty meal breaks. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were also required to perform job
23 duties off the clock, including before and/or after their scheduled shifts and during their meal or rest
24 breaks – including, but not limited to, assisting patients, communicating with management,
25 supervisors, and co-workers related to work, completing tasks and other work during breaks due to
26 their rigorous work schedules and lack of coverage/support, responding to supervisors and other
27 employees regarding work-related inquiries, preparing for shift start, and otherwise being required to
28 remain available for work during breaks. Defendants also had a policy and practice of unilaterally

1 falsifying and altering the clock in/out records for Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees so that
2 those records falsely showed that employees had clocked out for meal breaks before the fifth hour of
3 working (and clocked back in no less than 30 minutes thereafter) when that was false.

4 27. Defendants also fail to properly calculate the “regular rate of pay” for purposes of
5 calculating, *inter alia*, overtime, meal/rest break premium pay, and sick pay.

6 28. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to relieve Plaintiff and the
7 Aggrieved Employees of all duties, failed to relinquish control over Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
8 Employees’ activities, failed to permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees a reasonable
9 opportunity to take, and impeded, restricted (including geographically), or discouraged them from
10 taking, thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal breaks no later than the end of their fifth hour of work
11 for shifts lasting at least six (6) hours.

12 29. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
13 were entitled to receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff’s and
14 the Aggrieved Employees’ regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, shortened, late,
15 interrupted, restricted to the premises and/or otherwise not compliant with the requirements of
16 applicable California law, and they did not receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour
17 of pay at Plaintiff’s and the Aggrieved Employees’ regular rate of pay when a meal period was not
18 compliant with California law.

19 30. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to provide, authorize, and permit
20 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take full, uninterrupted, off-duty, unrestricted (including
21 geographically), and otherwise legally compliant rest periods for every shift lasting three and one-half
22 (3.5) to six (6) hours and/or two full, uninterrupted, off-duty and otherwise legally compliant rest
23 periods for every shift lasting six (6) to ten (10) hours, and/or three full, uninterrupted, off-duty and
24 otherwise legally compliant rest periods for every shift lasting more than ten (10) hours, and failed to
25 make a good faith effort to authorize, permit, and provide such rest breaks in the middle of each work
26 period.

27 31. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
28 were entitled to receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff’s and the

1 other Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, shortened, late,
2 interrupted, on-duty, restricted to the premises and/or otherwise not compliant with the requirements
3 of applicable California law, and they did not receive all rest periods or payment of one additional
4 hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay when a rest period
5 was not compliant with California law.

6 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
7 should have known that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive at least
8 minimum wages for compensation and that they were not receiving at least minimum wages for all
9 hours worked. Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages included, *inter alia*, Defendants' effective
10 payment of zero dollars per hour for hours Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees worked off
11 the clock performing work duties, including (but not limited to) duties such as those described in
12 herein.

13 33. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and the
14 Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements in accordance with California law.
15 The deficiencies included, *inter alia*, the failure to include (i) the accurate total number of hours
16 worked by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees; (ii) the accurate and applicable rates of pay in
17 effect during each pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; (iii)
18 the accurate gross wages and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned
19 for hours worked, correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not
20 provided in accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized
21 or permitted in accordance with California law, and correct sick pay wages); and (iv) complete and
22 correct deductions. As a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiff and
23 the Aggrieved Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

- 24 a. the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid minimum
25 wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium
26 wages to which they were entitled, even though they were entitled;
- 27
28

- 1 b. the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum, overtime,
2 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even though they had not
3 been;
- 4 c. the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum,
5 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct
6 California rate even though they were;
- 7 d. the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime, meal
8 period premium, rest period premium wages, and sick pay at the correct California
9 rate even though they had not been;
- 10 e. the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum, overtime,
11 meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- 12 f. in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
13 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have to
14 perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed to
15 them, computations they would not have to make if the wage statements contained
16 the required accurate information;
- 17 g. by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to lose
18 entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability,
19 unemployment, and other governmental benefits; and
- 20 h. the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages rates to
21 which Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled, and Plaintiff and the
22 Aggrieved Employees were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they
23 were entitled.

24 34. Defendants also failed to keep complete and accurate employment and payroll records
25 for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in accordance with California law, including Cal. Lab.
26 Code §§ 226(a), 1174(d), and the IWC Wage Orders.

27 35. During the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
28 Employees their correct wages owed upon separation from Defendants' employment and accordingly

1 owe waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 203. Further, Plaintiff is informed and
2 believes and based thereon alleges that such failure to pay at the regular rate was willful, such that
3 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees whose employment has separated are entitled to waiting time
4 penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203.

5 36. During the statutory period, Defendants did not reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
6 Employees for necessary business-related expenses, including (without limitation), expenses related
7 to the purchase and maintenance (including laundering) of various uniform items (including but not
8 limited to scrubs, shoes, and white jeans), expenses related to complying with Defendants' dress code
9 and grooming policies, and personal cell phone expenses (which were used for work purposes).

10 37. Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate and
11 reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had
12 the financial ability to pay such compensation and reimbursement, but willfully, knowingly, and
13 intentionally failed to do so, and falsely represented to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees that
14 they were properly paid all wages and reimbursements, all in order to increase Defendants' profits.

15 38. Defendants also forced Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, as a condition of
16 employment, to sign and abide by overbroad Confidentiality Agreements, which required employees
17 to refrain from "disclos[ing] or discuss[ing]" their wages with others, in violation of California Labor
18 Code §§ 232(a), 232(b), 232.5(a), 232.5(b), 1197.5(k), and 432.5. Such restrictive
19 covenants/agreements violate California law.

20 39. All of the conduct and violations alleged herein occurred during the statutory period.

21 40. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
22 were entitled to receive certain wages and that they were not receiving accurate compensation for all
23 hours worked.

24 41. As a result of the above facts, during the relevant time period, Defendants were and
25 continue to be in violation of the California Labor Code, including §§ 200-204, 204b, 210, 226, 226.3,
26 226.7, 232, 232.5, 233, 245-249, 432.5, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1175, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
27 1197.5, 1198, 1198.5, 2800, 2802, and 2804 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders related to these
28 claims arising under the California Labor Code.

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties under PAGA)**

3 42. Plaintiff incorporates herein by this reference all paragraphs above as though fully set
4 forth herein

5 43. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the California Labor Code
6 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

7 44. California Labor Code § 2699 specifically provides for a private right of action to
8 recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any
9 provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and
10 Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies,
11 or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action
12 brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former
13 employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.”

14 45. Plaintiff brings this cause of action as a proxy for the State of California on behalf of
15 the following “aggrieved employees” pursuant to PAGA, codified as Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*:

16 a. For claims/theories associated with subsections (i)-(viii) in Paragraph 1: all current
17 and former employees who worked for Defendants in California as hourly, non-
18 exempt employees at any time from one year prior to the postmark date of the
19 initial PAGA notice through the date of trial.

20 b. For claims/theories associated with subsections (ix)-(x) in Paragraph 1: all current
21 and former employees who worked for Defendants in California at any time from
22 one year prior to the postmark date of the initial PAGA notice through the date of
23 trial.

24 46. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, supplement, or add to this description of the
25 Aggrieved Employees, according to proof.

26 47. Labor Code § 2699.3 sets forth the procedure for commencing an action for civil
27 penalties under the PAGA.

1 48. As alleged, Defendants committed the following violations and are liable for all
2 corresponding civil penalties:

- 3 a. ***Unpaid Hours Worked/Minimum Wage.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197,
4 1197.1, 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- 5 b. ***Unpaid Overtime.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198; IWC Wage
6 Orders.
- 7 c. ***Improper Sick Pay.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 201-204, 233 and 246.
- 8 d. ***Unpaid Meal Period Premium Wages.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512,
9 516, 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- 10 e. ***Unpaid Rest Period Premium Wages.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516,
11 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- 12 f. ***Untimely Payment of Wages During Employment and Upon Termination.***
13 Violation of Labor Code §§ 201-204, 204b, 210.
- 14 g. ***Non-Compliant Wage Statements.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3.
- 15 h. ***Unreimbursed Employee Expenses.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 2800, 2802,
16 2804.
- 17 i. ***Failure to Provide Employee Records.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 1174,
18 1174.5, 1198.5; IWC Wage Orders.
- 19 j. ***Failure to Maintain Accurate Records.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 1174; 1174.5
20 IWC Wage Orders.
- 21 k. ***Illegal Restrictive Covenants.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 232(a), 232(b),
22 232.5(a), 232.5(b), 1197.5(k), and 432.5.

23 49. Plaintiff seeks to collect all recoverable civil penalties for the Labor Code violations
24 alleged in this Complaint and the PAGA notice (including amendments thereto) against Defendants
25 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (f), in addition to attorneys' fees, costs, and interest to the
26 extent permitted by law, including under Labor Code § 2699(k).

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the Aggrieved Employees, prays for relief
3 and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

- 4 1. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California Labor
5 Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum wages, overtime
6 wages, and premium wages), failing to pay at the correct rate, failing to provide compliant
7 meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof, failing to provide compliant rest periods or
8 compensation in lieu thereof, failing to maintain accurate records, failing to reimburse
9 business expenses, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;
- 10 2. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code
11 §§ 232(a), 232(b), 232.5(a), 232.5(b), 1197.5(k), and 432.5;
- 12 3. An award of civil penalties available under PAGA;
- 13 4. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate allowed;
- 14 5. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including expert fees, to the extent
15 permitted by law, associated with the PAGA claims;
- 16 6. Injunctive and declaratory relief to the extent allowed by PAGA; and
- 17 7. Such other and further relief that the Court deems proper.

18 Date: January 7, 2026

KV LAW, P.C.

19 /s/ Kristapor Vartanian

20 By: _____

21 Kristapor Vartanian
22 *Attorney for Plaintiff*
23
24
25
26
27
28