

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
N. Nick Ebrahimian, Esq. (SBN 219270)
Email: nebrahimian@lelawfirm.com
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
Alan A. Wilcox, Esq. (SBN 287476)
awilcox@lelawfirm.com
Melanie S. Rodriguez, Esq. (SBN 330280)
mrodriguez@lelawfirm.com
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
7/13/2023 10:10 AM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By E. Galicia, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff JOSE ANTONIO ARROYO,
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**

JOSE ANTONIO ARROYO, on behalf of himself
and current and former aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LEE KUM KEE USA, INC.; and DOES 1 to
100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **23STCV16328**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF JOSE ANTONIO
ARROYO'S COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff JOSE ANTONIO ARROYO ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and
complains against Defendants LEE KUM KEE USA, INC.; 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

1 with Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all
2 hours worked at the employees' minimum wage rate or overtime rate, failure to provide all legally
3 required and legally compliant meal and rest periods, failure to pay wages for accrued paid sick
4 time at the regular rate of pay, failure to timely pay earned wages during employment, failure to
5 produce requested employment records failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements,
6 and failure to timely pay all unpaid wages following separation of employment. Plaintiff seeks on
7 a 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 14841 Don Julian Road, City of
19 Industry, CA 91746.

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 City of Industry from
5 approximately April 21, 2021, until on or about May 9, 2022.

6 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant LEE KUM
7 KEE USA, INC. is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business
8 in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant hereto
9 were persons acting on behalf of Defendant LEE KUM KEE USA, INC. in the establishment of,
10 or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant LEE
11 KUM KEE USA, INC. operates in Los Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved
12 employees in Los Angeles County, including but not limited to, at 14841 Don Julian Road, City of
13 Industry, CA 91746.

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

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

25 8. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100. Plaintiff
26 sues said defendants by said fictitious names, and will amend this complaint when the true names
27 and capacities are ascertained or when such facts pertaining to liability are ascertained, or as
28 permitted by law or by the Court. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously

1 named defendants is in some manner responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this
2 complaint.

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

6 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

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

11 11. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding Plaintiff sending the initial
12 PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201,
13 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, and the applicable Wage Orders.

14 12. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California
15 Labor Code:

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

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

25 15. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
26 hourly non-exempt employees worked more minutes per shift than Defendants credited them with
27 having worked. Specifically, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former
28 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages at the applicable minimum

1 wage for all hours worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but
2 not limited to:

3 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
4 non-exempt employees to line up to wait to undergo and undergo off-the-clock COVID-19
5 temperature checks prior to being permitted to clock in for their start shift;

6 (b) After successfully completing the aforementioned COVID-19 procedures, Plaintiff
7 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees required
8 to travel to the time clock to line up and wait to clock-in; and

9 (c) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
10 non-exempt employees to keep their employer-issued cellphones on their person and to always
11 monitor them and to take and respond to Defendant's management personnel at all times during
12 their shift resulting in Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
13 non-exempt employees remaining on duty during their off-the-clock meal breaks.

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

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

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

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

Labor Code section 510.

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

(a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to line up to wait to undergo and undergo off-the-clock COVID-19 temperature checks prior to being permitted to clock in for their start shift;

(b) After successfully completing the aforementioned COVID-19 procedures, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees required to travel to the time clock to line up and wait to clock-in; and

(c) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to keep their employer-issued cellphones on their person and to always monitor them and to take and respond to Defendant's management personnel at all times during their shift resulting in Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees remaining on duty during their off-the-clock meal breaks.

23. Overtime is based upon an employee's regular rate of pay. "The regular rate at which an employee is employed shall be deemed to include all remuneration for employment paid to, or on behalf, of the employee." See Division of Labor Standards Enforcement – Enforcement Policies and Interpretations Manual, Section 49.1.2.

24. In this case, Plaintiff alleges that when he and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees earned overtime wages, Defendants failed to pay them overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay due to Defendants' failure to include all remuneration when calculating the overtime rate of pay. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as "shift differential

1 pay” and “premium 4 pay,” for example, when calculating Plaintiff’s and other current and former
2 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees’ regular rate of pay for purposes of
3 paying overtime wages.

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

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

16 22. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an
17 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of
18 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee’s activities prior to the
19 employee’s sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512; Wage Order 9 at §11; *Brinker*
20 *Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ an
21 employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee
22 with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh
23 hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period
24 shall be considered an “on duty” meal period and counted as time worked. A paid “on duty” meal
25 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being
26 relieved of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

27 23. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
28 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay

1 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
2 section 226.7; Wage Order 9 at §11.

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

7 (a) Failing to provide duty-free meal breaks due to Defendant requiring Plaintiff and
8 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to keep their
9 employer-issued cellphones on their person and to always monitor them and to take and respond to
10 Defendant's management personnel at all times during their shift resulting in Plaintiff and other
11 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees remaining on duty
12 during their off-the-clock meal breaks; and

13 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
14 hourly non-exempt employees a second uninterrupted duty-free meal period of no less than thirty
15 (30) minutes for each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
16 based hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

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

23 26. Finally, On occasions when Defendants paid Plaintiff and other current and former
24 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a "premium" wage for late, missed,
25 short, on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted meal periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1)
26 additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based
27 hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained
28 a policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as "shift differential

1 pay” and “premium 4 pay,” for example, when calculating Plaintiff’s and other current and former
2 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees’ regular rate of compensation for the
3 purpose of calculating and paying meal period premium wages.

4 27. Defendants’ foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff
5 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not
6 receiving wages to compensate them for workdays during which Defendants did not provide them
7 with meal periods in compliance with California law.

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

12 29. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
13 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor
14 Code section 226.7; Wage Order 9 at §12. Under California law, “[e]mployees are entitled to 10
15 minutes’ rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more
16 than six hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so
17 on.” *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code
18 section 226.7; Wage Order 9 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of
19 each work period. Wage Order 9 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement “obligates
20 employers to permit – and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM*
21 *Security Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must
22 relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

23 30. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer
24 must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday
25 the employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7;
26 Wage Order 9 at § 12.

27 31. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit all legally required and
28 compliant rest periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly

1 non-exempt employees due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not
2 limited to:

3 (a) Failure to provide duty-free rest breaks due to Defendant requiring Plaintiff and
4 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to keep their
5 employer-issued cellphones on their person and to always monitor them and to take and respond to
6 Defendant's management personnel at all times during their shift resulting in Plaintiff and other
7 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees remaining on duty
8 during their rest breaks; and

9 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
10 hourly non-exempt employees a third uninterrupted duty-free rest period of no less than ten (10)
11 net minutes on each workday that Plaintiff and similarly situated employees work shifts over ten
12 (10) hours.

13 32. 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 33. Finally, on occasions when Defendants paid Plaintiff and other current and former
19 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a "premium" wage for late, missed,
20 short, on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted meal periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1)
21 additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based
22 hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained
23 a policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as "shift differential
24 pay" and "premium 4 pay," for example, when calculating Plaintiff's and other current and former
25 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of compensation for the
26 purpose of calculating and paying meal period premium wages.

27 34. Defendants' foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff
28 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not

1 receiving wages to compensate them for workdays in which Defendants did not provide them with
2 rest periods in compliance with California law.

3 **35. Failure to pay wages for accrued paid sick days at the regular rate of pay:**
4 Defendants had a policy and/or procedure where Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
5 California-based hourly non-exempt employees accrued paid sick time.

6 36. Labor Code section 246, subdivision (a), states in relevant part “[a]n employee
7 who...works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the
8 commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days.” Additionally, an employee accrues
9 paid sick days at the rate of no-less-than one (1) hour per every thirty (30) hours worked,
10 beginning at the commencement of employment. Labor Code section 246(b).

11 37. Here, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
12 exempt employees were employed by Defendants for 30 or more days and were entitled to paid
13 sick days. Also, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
14 exempt employees began accruing paid sick days since the beginning of each of their respective
15 employment with Defendants.

16 38. Labor Code section 246, subdivision (l), provides that an employer shall calculate
17 the paid sick time for non-exempt employees in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the
18 workweek in which the employee elected to use paid sick time. “The regular rate at which an
19 employee is employed shall be deemed to include all remuneration for employment paid to, or on
20 behalf, of the employee.” See Division of Labor Standards Enforcement – Enforcement Policies
21 and Interpretations Manual, Section 49.1.2.

22 39. In this case, Plaintiff alleges that when he and other current and former aggrieved
23 California-based hourly non-exempt employees elected to use paid sick time, Defendants failed to
24 pay them sick time wages at the proper sick time rate of pay due to Defendants’ failure to include
25 all remuneration when calculating the sick time rate of pay. Specifically, Defendants maintained a
26 policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as, for example,
27 “shift differential pay” and “premium 4 pay,” when calculating Plaintiff’s and other current and
28 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees’ regular rate of pay for the

1 purpose of calculating and paying sick time.

2 40. Defendants' foregoing policy, practice, and/or procedure resulted in Defendants
3 failing to provide Plaintiff and similarly situated employees paid sick days, in violation of Labor
4 Code section 246.

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

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

21 43. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section
22 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an
23 employee his or her wages, the employer must "furnish each of his or her employees ... an
24 itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the
25 employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is
26 exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of
27 the Industrial Welfare Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable
28 piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all

1 deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5)
2 net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the
3 name of the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal
4 entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
5 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

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

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

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

21 47. Defendants’ violations of Wage Order 9 constituted violations of Labor Code
22 section 1198, which prohibits employment under conditions of labor that violate the Wage Orders.

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

27 49. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor
28 Code section 2699.3. On May 8, 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, 510, 512, 1194, and 1197, 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, and 512; 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

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

ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

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

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

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

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

Dated: July 13, 2023

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

By:



Joseph Lavi, Esq.
N. Nick Ebrahimian, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Alan Wilcox, Esq.
Melanie S. Rodriguez, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
JOSE ANTONIO ARROYO,
on behalf of himself and current and former
aggrieved employees