

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Danielle E. Montero, Esq. (SBN 333945)

LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Emails: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
dmontero@lelawfirm.com
WHT2@lelawfirm.com

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
7/14/2023 10:20 AM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By E. Galicia, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff ALFRED GUEVARA,
on behalf of himself and current and former aggrieved employees,

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES-CENTRAL DISTRICT**

ALFRED GUEVARA, on behalf of himself and
current and former aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

HATHAWAY-SYCAMORES CHILD AND
FAMILY SERVICES dba THE SYCAMORES;
and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **23STCV16464**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF ALFRED GUEVARA'S
COMPLAINT FOR:**

- CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT
TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT OF 2004
("PAGA"), LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

COMES NOW Plaintiff ALFRED GUEVARA ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains
against Defendants HATHAWAY-SYCAMORES CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES dba THE
SYCAMORES; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive (collectively "Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*
("PAGA") representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California, himself
and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-
exempt employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated
with Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all

1 hours worked at the employees' minimum wage rate or overtime rate, failure to provide all legally
2 required and legally compliant meal and rest periods, failure to pay accrued and vested
3 vacation/PTO wages, indemnification for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by
4 employees in direct consequence of discharging their duties; failure to timely pay earned wages
5 during employment, failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements, and failure to
6 timely pay all unpaid wages following separation of employment. Plaintiff seeks on a
7 representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil
8 penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought
9 on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

10 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

11 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
12 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
13 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
14 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars
15 (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
16 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
17 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
18 California, including but not limited to Los Angeles County at 851 N. Oakland Ave, Pasadena, CA
19 91104.

20 3. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Judicial Council of California enacted
21 Emergency Rule 9 to the California Rules of Court, which provided that, notwithstanding any
22 other law, the statutes of limitations and repose for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are
23 tolled from April 6, 2020, until October 1, 2020.

24 **III. PARTIES**

25 4. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
26 Development Agency on behalf of himself and other current and former employees subject to
27 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
28 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will

1 work for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
2 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the
3 currently named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was
4 employed by Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Pasadena from
5 approximately September 20, 2021 until on or about July 27, 2022.

6 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant
7 HATHAWAY-SYCAMORES CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES dba THE SYCAMORES is
8 authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business in the State of
9 California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant hereto were persons
10 acting on behalf of Defendant HATHAWAY-SYCAMORES CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES
11 dba THE SYCAMORES in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal
12 wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant HATHAWAY-SYCAMORES CHILD AND
13 FAMILY SERVICES dba THE SYCAMORES operates in Los Angeles County and employed
14 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County, including but not limited to, at 851 N.
15 Oakland Ave, Pasadena, CA 91104.

16 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 1
17 through 50 are corporations, or are other business entities or organizations of a nature unknown to
18 Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California non-exempt employees, permitted
19 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised control over the wages, hours and
20 working conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

21 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 51
22 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each of the individual defendants is sued
23 individually and in his or her capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner, representative, manager,
24 supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant who violated or caused to
25 be violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor Code and/or any provision of
26 the Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

27 8. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100. Plaintiff
28 sues said defendants by said fictitious names, and will amend this complaint when the true names

1 and capacities are ascertained or when such facts pertaining to liability are ascertained, or as
2 permitted by law or by the Court. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously
3 named defendants is in some manner responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this
4 complaint.

5 9. Plaintiff makes the allegations in this complaint without any admission that, as to
6 any particular allegation, Plaintiff bears the burden of pleading, proving, or persuading and
7 Plaintiff reserves all of Plaintiff's right to plead in the alternative.

8 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **CIVIL PENALTIES AND WAGES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS**

10 **GENERAL ACT OF 2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

11 **(Against all Defendants by Plaintiff)**

12 10. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

13 11. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding Plaintiff sending the initial
14 PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201,
15 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 2802, and the applicable Wage Orders.

16 12. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California
17 Labor Code:

18 13. **Failure to pay wages for all hours worked at the legal minimum wage:**
19 Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt
20 employees. In California, an employer is required to pay hourly employees for all "hours worked,"
21 which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the
22 employee is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either
23 directly or indirectly, performing services which inure to the benefit of the employer.

24 14. Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 require an employer to compensate employees
25 for all "hours worked" at least at a minimum wage rate of pay as established by the IWC and the
26 Wage Orders.

27 15. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
28 hourly non-exempt employees worked more minutes per shift than Defendants credited them with

1 having worked. Specifically, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former
2 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages at the applicable minimum
3 wage for all hours worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but
4 not limited to:

5 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
6 non-exempt employees to remain on-duty during their off-the-clock meal breaks;

7 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
8 non-exempt employees who work opening and closing shifts to perform off-the-clock procedures
9 including, but not limited to:

10 i. Unlock and lock Defendant's Premises; and

11 ii. Disarm and arm Defendant's alarm system;

12 (c) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
13 non-exempt employees to answer calls from Defendant's management personnel while being off-
14 the-clock;

15 (d) Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
16 exempt employees who work remotely were required to set up home equipment while off-the-
17 clock.

18 16. Therefore, Defendants suffered, permitted, and required Plaintiff and other current
19 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to be subject to Defendants'
20 control without paying wages for that time. This resulted in Plaintiff and other current and former
21 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees working time for which they were not
22 compensated any wages, in violation of Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 and the applicable
23 Wage Order.

24 17. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay:**
25 Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt
26 employees. In California, an employer is required to pay hourly employees for all "hours worked,"
27 which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the
28 employee is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either

1 directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to the benefit of the employer.’

2 18. Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 require an employer to compensate employees a
3 higher rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, in excess of forty
4 (40) hours in a workweek, and on any seventh consecutive day of work in a workweek:

5 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40)
6 hours in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of
7 work in any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-
8 one-half (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve
9 (12) hours in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular
rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any
seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the
regular rate of pay of an employee.

10 Labor Code section 510.

11 19. In this case, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former
12 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees overtime wages for all overtime hours
13 worked due to Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to:

14 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
15 non-exempt employees to remain on-duty during their off-the-clock meal breaks;

16 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
17 non-exempt employees who work opening and closing shifts to perform off-the-clock procedures
18 including, but not limited to:

19 i. Unlock and lock Defendant’s Premises; and

20 ii. Disarm and arm Defendant’s alarm system;

21 (c) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
22 non-exempt employees to answer calls from Defendant’s management personnel while being off-
23 the-clock; and

24 (d) Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
25 exempt employees who work remotely were required to set up home equipment while off-the-
26 clock.

27 20. The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each
28 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt

1 employees were under the control of Defendants but were not compensated. To the extent that the
2 foregoing uncompensated time occurred when Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
3 California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday,
4 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendants failed
5 to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code
6 sections 510 and 1194 and the applicable Wage Order.

7 21. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
8 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant meal periods:** Plaintiff and other
9 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked
10 shifts of more than five (5) hours in length and shifts of more than ten (10) hours in length.

11 22. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an
12 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of
13 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the
14 employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512; Wage Order 5 at §11; *Brinker*
15 *Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ an
16 employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee
17 with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh
18 hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period
19 shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. A paid "on duty" meal
20 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being
21 relieved of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

22 23. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
23 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay
24 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
25 section 226.7; Wage Order 5 at §11.

26 24. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit legally required and compliant
27 meal periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
28 exempt employees due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures, including but not

1 limited to:

2 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
3 hourly non-exempt employees imely, uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes
4 for every five hours worked.

5 25. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
6 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
7 based hourly non-exempt employees one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each
8 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
9 employees did not receive legally required and compliant meal periods, in violation of Labor Code
10 section 226.7.

11 26. Defendants' foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff
12 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not
13 receiving wages to compensate them for workdays during which Defendants did not provide them
14 with meal periods in compliance with California law.

15 27. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
16 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant rest periods:** Plaintiff and other
17 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked
18 shifts of more than three-and-a-half (3.5) hours.

19 28. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
20 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor
21 Code section 226.7; Wage Order 5 at §12. Under California law, "[e]mployees are entitled to 10
22 minutes' rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more
23 than six hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so
24 on." *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code
25 section 226.7; Wage Order 5 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of
26 each work period. Wage Order 5 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement "obligates
27 employers to permit – and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods." *Augustus v. ABM*
28 *Security Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must

1 relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

2 29. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer
3 must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday
4 the employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7;
5 Wage Order 5 at § 12.

6 30. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit all legally required and
7 compliant rest periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
8 non-exempt employees due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not
9 limited to:

10 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiffs and other current and former aggrieved California-
11 based hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours
12 worked or major fraction thereof.

13 31. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
14 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
15 based hourly non-exempt employees with one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each
16 workday they did not receive legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor
17 Code section 226.7.

18 32. Defendants' foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff
19 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not
20 receiving wages to compensate them for workdays in which Defendants did not provide them with
21 rest periods in compliance with California law.

22 33. **Failure to pay accrued and vested vacation wages:** Defendants had a policy
23 and/or procedure of providing its employees with paid vacation time and/or personal time off
24 ("PTO").

25 34. Vacation/PTO wages are deferred wages that vest once accrued. California Labor
26 Code § 227.3 provides that an employer must pay its employees all unused vested vacation/PTO at
27 the time of termination at the employees' final rate of pay.

28 35. Defendants had a vacation policy in which Plaintiff and other current and former

aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees accrued vacation/PTO wages.

36. Defendants terminated Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees without paying them the full amount of their earned vacation/PTO wages, in violation of California law, and employed policies and procedures which ensured Plaintiff and those other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees would not receive their accrued and vested vacation/PTO wages upon termination.

37. **Failure to Indemnify for Losses and Expenditures Incurred as Part of Employment:** California law requires that every employer must indemnify its employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in discharge of his or her duties or at the obedience of the directions of the employer. Moreover, an employer is prohibited from passing the ordinary business expenses and losses of the employer onto the employee. (Lab. Code, § 2802.)

38. Defendants have violated Labor Code Section 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees' necessary expenditures they incurred in the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendants employed a policy, practice, and procedure whereby Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees who worked remotely were not reimbursed for home internet usage; and requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to use personal cellphone (including both telephone use and cellular data use) for work-related purposes - without reimbursing Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees for such use.

39. Moreover, Defendants employed policies and procedures which ensured Plaintiff and aggrieved employees would not receive indemnification for their employment related expenses. This practice resulted in Plaintiff and aggrieved employees not receiving such indemnification in compliance with California law.

40. Therefore, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for their employment related expenses, including but not limited to costs related to use of their personal

1 cell phones and costs associated with their uniforms pursuant to Labor Code section 2802.

2 41. **Failure to timely pay earned wages during employment:** In California, wages
3 must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the
4 employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code section 204(a). Wages
5 earned between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the
6 16th and the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day,
7 inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following
8 month. *Id.* Other payroll periods such as those that are weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly, must be
9 paid within seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period in which wages were
10 earned. Labor Code section 204(d).

11 42. As a derivative of Plaintiff's claims above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed
12 to timely pay Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
13 exempt employees' earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period
14 premium wages and/or rest period premium wages), in violation of Labor Code section 204.
15 Defendants' aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in their failure to pay
16 Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees'
17 their earned wages within the applicable time frames outlined in Labor Code section 204.

18 43. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section
19 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an
20 employee his or her wages, the employer must "furnish each of his or her employees ... an
21 itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the
22 employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is
23 exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of
24 the Industrial Welfare Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable
25 piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all
26 deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5)
27 net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the
28 name of the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal

entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

44. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period premium wages) rendered Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees’ wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section 226.

45. **Failure to pay employees all wages due at time of termination/resignation:** An employer is required to pay all unpaid wages timely after an employee’s employment ends. The wages are due immediately upon termination (Labor Code section 201) or within seventy-two (72) hours of resignation (Labor Code section 202).

46. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, because Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all their earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period premium wages), Defendants failed to pay those employees timely after each employee’s termination and/or resignation, in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

47. Defendants’ violations of Wage Order 5 constituted violations of Labor Code section 1198, which prohibits employment under conditions of labor that violate the Wage Orders.

48. Labor Code sections 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees, to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties against all Defendants pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

49. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code section 2699.3. On May 9, 2023, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the violations alleged.

50. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the parties notice within 60 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

51. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204 226, 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 1194, 1197,2802, beginning one (1) year preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the following amounts:

a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226.7, 512, and 2802; one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

b. For violations of Labor Code section 226, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, one thousand dollars (\$1000) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 226.3].

c. For violations of Labor Code section 510, fifty dollars (\$50) for each employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 558] and any unpaid wages.

d. For violations of Labor Code section 1194 and 1197, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 1197.1] and any unpaid wages.

52. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g), Plaintiff is entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with his claims for civil penalties.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

1 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND ON OTHER
2 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:

3 ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

4 1. That Defendants be found to have violated the provisions of the Labor Code and
5 the IWC Wages Orders as to the Plaintiff and aggrieved employees;

6 2. For any and all legally applicable penalties during the relevant statute of limitations
7 subject to any permissible tolling, including but not limited to those recoverable under the
8 California Labor Code, including but not limited to section 2699(f);

9 3. For attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including but not limited to those recoverable
10 under California Labor Code section 2699(g); and

11 4. For such and other further relief, in law and/or equity, as the Court deems just or
12 appropriate

13
14 Dated: July 14, 2023

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

15
16 By:



17 Joseph Lavi, Esq.
18 Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
19 Danielle E. Montero, Esq.
20 Attorneys for Plaintiff
21 ALFRED GUEVARA
22 on behalf of himself and current and former
23 aggrieved employees
24
25
26
27
28