

1 **AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC**  
2 SAMUEL A. WONG, State Bar No. 217104  
3 KASHIF HAQUE, State Bar No. 218672  
4 JESSICA L. CAMPBELL, State Bar No. 280626  
5 9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100  
6 Irvine, California 92618  
7 Telephone: (949) 379-6250  
8 Facsimile: (949) 379-6251  
9 Email: [jcampbell@aegislawfirm.com](mailto:jcampbell@aegislawfirm.com)

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff Jonathan Cruz Arizmendi, individually,  
11 and on behalf of all others similarly situated.

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**  
Superior Court of California,  
County of Kern  
By: Julia Barrera  
Deputy Clerk  
**03/11/26 8:46 AM**

12 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

13 **FOR THE COUNTY OF KERN**

14 JONATHAN CRUZ ARIZMENDI,  
15 individually and on behalf of all others  
16 similarly situated,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19 TRUITT OILFIELD MAINTENANCE  
20 CORPORATION; and DOES 1 through 20,  
21 inclusive,

22 Defendants.

Case No. 25CUB01107

*Assigned for All Purposes to:  
Judge Bernard C. Barmann, Jr; Division H*

**[Amended as a matter of right, pursuant to  
Labor Code section 2699.3(a)(2)(C)]**

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION  
COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
4. Failure to Permit Rest Breaks;
5. Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses;
6. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
7. Failure to Pay All Wages Due Upon Separation of Employment;
8. Violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and
9. Enforcement of Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* ("PAGA")

1 Plaintiff Jonathan Cruz Arizmendi, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,  
2 alleges as follows:

3 **NATURE OF ACTION AND INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT**

4 1. Plaintiff Jonathan Cruz Arizmendi (“Plaintiff”) brings this putative class action and  
5 representative action pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code. §  
6 2698 *et seq.*, against defendants Truitt Oilfield Maintenance Corporation, and DOES 1 through 20,  
7 inclusive (collectively, “Defendants”), on Plaintiff’s own behalf and on behalf of persons who are  
8 and were employed by any or all Defendants as non-exempt employees throughout California.

9 2. Defendants provide services or goods throughout California.

10 3. Through this action, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants engaged in a systematic  
11 pattern of wage and hour violations under the California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare  
12 Commission (“IWC”) Wage Orders, all of which contribute to Defendants’ deliberate unfair  
13 competition.

14 4. Plaintiff is informed and believe, and thereon alleges, that Defendants have  
15 increased their profits by violating state wage and hour laws by, among other things:

- 16 (a) failing to pay all wages (including minimum wages and overtime wages);
- 17 (b) failing to provide lawful meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof;
- 18 (c) failing to authorize or permit lawful rest breaks or provide compensation in  
19 lieu thereof;
- 20 (d) failing to reimburse necessary business-related costs;
- 21 (e) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements;
- 22 (f) failing to pay wages timely during employment; and
- 23 (g) failing to pay all wages due upon separation of employment.

24 5. Plaintiff seeks monetary relief against Defendants on behalf of Plaintiff and all  
25 others similarly situated in California to recover, among other things, unpaid wages, un-reimbursed  
26 business expenses, benefits, interest, attorneys’ fees, costs and expenses, and penalties pursuant to  
27 Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 233, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5,  
28

1 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, 2698, *et seq.*, and Code of California Civil  
2 Procedure § 1021.5.

### 3 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4 6. This is a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. The  
5 monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdictional limits of  
6 the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

7 7. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution,  
8 Article VI, § 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except those  
9 given by statutes to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any  
10 other basis for jurisdiction.

11 8. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and  
12 belief, they are citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise  
13 intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction  
14 over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial  
15 justice.

16 9. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants  
17 reside, transact business, or have offices in this county, and the acts and omissions alleged herein  
18 took place in this county.

### 19 **THE PARTIES**

20 10. Plaintiff is a resident of California and worked for Defendants during the relevant  
21 time periods as alleged herein.

22 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that at all times hereinafter  
23 mentioned, Defendants were and are subject to the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders as  
24 employers, whose employees were and are engaged throughout this county and the State of  
25 California.

26 12. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names or capacities of the defendants sued herein  
27 under the fictitious names DOES 1 through 20, but will seek leave of this Court to amend this  
28

1 Complaint and serve such fictitiously named defendants once their names and capacities become  
2 known.

3 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DOES 1 through 20 are  
4 or were the partners, agents, owners, shareholders, managers, or employees of Defendants at all  
5 relevant times.

6 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each defendant acted in  
7 all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other defendant, carried out a joint scheme,  
8 business plan, or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally  
9 attributable to the other defendant. Furthermore, defendants in all respects acted as the employer  
10 and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and the class members.

11 15. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and all of the acts  
12 and omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to, Defendants and/or DOES  
13 1 through 20, acting as the agent or alter ego for the other, with legal authority to act on the other's  
14 behalf. The acts of any and all Defendants were in accordance with, and represent, the official  
15 policy of Defendants.

16 16. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, acted within the scope of such  
17 agency or employment, or ratified each and every act or omission complained of herein. At all  
18 relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of each  
19 and all the other Defendants in proximately causing the damages herein alleged.

20 17. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said Defendants  
21 is in some manner intentionally, negligently, or otherwise responsible for the acts, omissions,  
22 occurrences, and transactions alleged herein.

23 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

24 18. Plaintiff brings this action under Code of Civil Procedure § 382 on Plaintiff's own  
25 behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated who were affected by Defendants' Labor Code,  
26 Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, and IWC Wage Order violations.

27 19. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief  
28 authorized by California law.

1           20.     Plaintiff's proposed class consists of and is defined as follows:

2                 Class

3                 All persons currently or formerly employed by any or all Defendants as non-exempt  
4                 employees in the State of California at any time between December 29, 2021 and  
5                 the date of class certification ("Class").

6           21.     Plaintiff also seeks to certify the following subclasses of employees:

7                 Waiting Time Subclass

8                 All members of the Class who separated their employment with any or all  
9                 Defendants at any time between December 29, 2022 and the date of class  
10                certification ("Waiting Time Subclass").

11           22.     Plaintiff reserves the right to modify or re-define the Class, establish additional  
12            subclasses, or modify or re-define any class or subclass definition as appropriate based on  
13            investigation, discovery, and specific theories of liability.

14           23.     Members of the Class and the Waiting Time Subclass described above will be  
15            collectively referred to as "Class Members."

16           24.     There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class Members that  
17            predominate over any questions affecting only individual members including, but not limited to,  
18            the following:

19               (a)     Whether Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members all wages  
20                       (including minimum wages and overtime wages) for all hours worked by  
21                       Plaintiff and Class Members.

22               (b)     Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to work over  
23                       eight (8) hours per day, over twelve (12) hours per day, and/or over forty  
24                       (40) hours per week and failed to pay them proper overtime compensation  
25                       for all overtime hours worked.

26               (c)     Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of timely meal  
27                       periods or required Plaintiff and Class Members to work through meal  
28                       periods without legal compensation.

- 1 (d) Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of rest breaks or  
2 required Plaintiff and Class Members to work through rest breaks.
- 3 (e) Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for  
4 necessary business-related costs expended for the benefit of Defendants.
- 5 (f) Whether Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members accurate  
6 itemized wage statements.
- 7 (g) Whether Defendants failed to pay wages timely to Plaintiff and Class  
8 Members;
- 9 (h) Whether Defendants failed to timely pay the Waiting Time Subclass all  
10 wages due upon termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of  
11 resignation.
- 12 (i) Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless.
- 13 (j) Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of  
14 Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

15 25. There is a well-defined community of interest in this litigation and the proposed  
16 Class and subclasses are readily ascertainable:

17 (a) Numerosity: The Class Members are so numerous that joinder of all  
18 members is impractical. Although the members of the Class are unknown to Plaintiff at this time,  
19 on information and belief, the Class is estimated to be greater than fifty (50) individuals. The  
20 identities of the Class Members are readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment  
21 and payroll records.

22 (b) Typicality: Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) are typical of the claims  
23 (or defenses, if any) of the Class Members because Defendants' failure to comply with the  
24 provisions of California's wage and hour laws entitled each Class Member to similar pay, benefits,  
25 and other relief. The injuries sustained by Plaintiff are also typical of the injuries sustained by the  
26 Class Members, because they arise out of and are caused by Defendants' common course of  
27 conduct as alleged herein.

28

1 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the  
2 interests of all Class Members because it is in Plaintiff's best interest to prosecute the claims  
3 alleged herein to obtain full compensation and penalties due. Plaintiff's attorneys, as proposed  
4 class counsel, are competent and experienced in litigating large employment class actions and  
5 versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has  
6 incurred and, throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur attorneys' fees and costs  
7 that have been and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial  
8 benefit of the Class Members.

9 (d) Superiority: The nature of this action makes use of class action adjudication  
10 superior to other methods. A class action will achieve economies of time, effort, and expense as  
11 compared with separate lawsuits and will avoid inconsistent outcomes because the same issues can  
12 be adjudicated in the same manner for the entire Class and Waiting Time Subclass at the same  
13 time. If appropriate, this Court can, and is empowered to, fashion methods to efficiently manage  
14 this case as a class action.

15 (e) Public Policy Considerations: Employers in the State of California violate  
16 employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out  
17 of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are fearful of bringing actions because  
18 they believe their former employers might damage their future endeavors through negative  
19 references and/or other means. Class actions provide class members who are not named in the  
20 complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights while affording  
21 them privacy protections.

## 22 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

23 26. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other  
24 California residents as non-exempt employees throughout California.

25 27. Defendants continue to employ non-exempt employees within California.

26 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein  
27 mentioned, Defendants were advised by skilled lawyers, employees, and other professionals who  
28

1 were knowledgeable about California's wage and hour laws, employment and personnel practices,  
2 and the requirements of California law.

3 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or  
4 should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive wages for all time  
5 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages) and that they were not receiving all  
6 wages earned for work that was required to be performed. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC  
7 Wage Orders, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and Class Members all wages owed (including  
8 minimum wages and overtime wages) for all hours worked at the correct rate and within the correct  
9 time period.

10 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or  
11 should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive all required meal  
12 periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and Class Members' regular rate  
13 of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted meal period. In violation of the Labor  
14 Code and IWC Wage Orders, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and Class Members all meal  
15 periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and Class Members' regular rate  
16 of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted meal period.

17 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or  
18 should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive all rest breaks or  
19 payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and Class Members' regular rate of pay  
20 when a rest break was late, missed, or interrupted. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage  
21 Orders, Defendants did not authorize or permit all rest breaks for Plaintiff and Class Members or  
22 payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and Class Members' regular rate of pay  
23 when a rest break was missed, late, or interrupted.

24 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or  
25 should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to reimbursement and/or  
26 indemnification for all necessary business expenditures or losses as a direct consequence of the  
27 discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of Defendants. In violation of the  
28 Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members incurred necessary business

1 expenses or losses, but Defendants did not reimburse nor indemnify such expenses or losses that  
2 were incurred as a direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the  
3 directions of Defendants.

4 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or  
5 should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive itemized wage  
6 statements that accurately showed the following information pursuant to the Labor Code: (1) gross  
7 wages earned; (2) total hours worked by the employee; (3) the number of piece-rate units earned  
8 and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis; (4) all deductions,  
9 provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown  
10 as one item; (5) net wages earned; (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is  
11 paid; (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number  
12 or an employee identification number other than a social security number; (8) the name and address  
13 of the legal entity that is the employer; and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay  
14 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. In  
15 violation of the Labor Code, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate  
16 itemized wage statements.

17 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or  
18 should have known that the Class Members were entitled to timely payment of wages due upon  
19 separation of employment. In violation of the Labor Code, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and  
20 the Class Members all wages within the permissible time periods.

21 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or  
22 should have known they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and Class Members, and Defendants  
23 had the financial ability to pay such compensation but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally  
24 failed to do so in order to increase Defendants' profits.

25 36. Therefore, Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking monetary and injunctive relief  
26 against Defendants on Plaintiff's own behalf and on behalf of all Class Members to recover, among  
27 other things, unpaid wages (including minimum wages and overtime wages), unpaid meal period  
28

1 premium payments, unpaid rest period premium payments, unreimbursed business expenditures,  
2 interest, attorneys' fees, penalties, costs, and expenses.

3 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

5 (Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194, 1194.2, and 1197; Violation of IWC Wage Order §3-4)

6 37. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as  
7 though fully set forth herein.

8 38. Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197 provide that the minimum wage for employees fixed  
9 by the IWC is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than  
10 the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

11 39. Plaintiff and Class Members were employees entitled to the protections of Labor  
12 Code §§ 1194 and 1197.

13 40. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class  
14 Members all wages owed when Defendants did not pay minimum wage for all hours worked.

15 41. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay at least minimum wage  
16 to Plaintiff and Class Members for all hours worked pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197.

17 42. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members the required minimum wage  
18 violates Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197. Pursuant to these sections, Plaintiff and Class Members  
19 are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum wage compensation as well as interest,  
20 costs, and attorneys' fees.

21 43. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1194.2, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to  
22 recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and the accrued  
23 interest thereon.

24 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME**

26 (Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198; Violation of IWC Wage Order § 3)

27 44. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as  
28 though fully set forth herein.

1           45. Labor Code § 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that it is unlawful  
2 to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either one and one-half (1½) or  
3 two (2) times the person's regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the  
4 person on a daily or weekly basis.

5           46. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Orders provide that Defendants are and  
6 were required to pay overtime compensation to Plaintiff and Class Members at the rate of one and  
7 one-half times (1½) their regular rate of pay when working and for all hours worked in excess of  
8 eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek and for the first eight (8)  
9 hours of work on the seventh day of work in a workweek.

10           47. The applicable IWC Wage Orders further provide that Defendants are and were  
11 required to pay overtime compensation to Plaintiff and Class Members at a rate of two times their  
12 regular rate of pay when working and for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day  
13 or in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh day of work in a workweek.

14           48. California Labor Code § 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one and  
15 one-half (1½) times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day  
16 or forty (40) hours in a week and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh consecutive  
17 day of work, and overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess  
18 of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day of work in  
19 a workweek.

20           49. Labor Code § 510 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders provide that employment  
21 of more than six days in a workweek is only permissible if the employer pays proper overtime  
22 compensation as set forth herein.

23           50. Plaintiff and Class Members were employees entitled to the protections of  
24 California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194.

25           51. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members  
26 to work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, forty (40) hours in a week, and/or on a seventh  
27 consecutive day of work, entitling them to overtime wages.  
28

1           52. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class  
2 Members overtime wages for all overtime hours worked. To the extent these hours qualify for the  
3 payment of overtime wages, Plaintiff and Class Members were not paid proper overtime wages.

4           53. In violation of California law, Defendants knowingly and willfully refused to  
5 perform their obligations and compensate Plaintiff and Class Members for all wages earned and  
6 all hours worked.

7           54. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members the unpaid balance of  
8 overtime compensation, as required by California law, violates the provisions of Labor Code §§  
9 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

10          55. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1194, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover  
11 their unpaid overtime and double time compensation as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

### 12                                   **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### 13                                   **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

14                   (Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; Violation of IWC Wage Order § 11)

15          56. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as  
16 though fully set forth herein.

17          57. Labor Code § 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work  
18 during any meal period mandated by the IWC Wage Orders.

19          58. Section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order states, "[n]o employer shall employ  
20 any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30  
21 minutes, except that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete the day's  
22 work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee."

23          59. Labor Code § 512(a) provides that an employer may not require, cause, or permit  
24 an employee to work for a period of more than five (5) hours in a day without providing the  
25 employee with an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the  
26 total work period per day of the employee is not more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be  
27 waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee.

1           60. Labor Code § 512(a) also provides that an employer may not employ an employee  
2 for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a  
3 second meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no  
4 more than twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the  
5 employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

6           61. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Class Members worked more than  
7 five (5) or ten (10) hours and did not receive all compliant meal periods because their meal periods  
8 were missed, late, short, interrupted, and/or they were not permitted to take a second meal period.

9           62. Labor Code § 226.7(b) and section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order require  
10 an employer to pay an employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of  
11 compensation for each work day that a compliant meal period is not provided.

12           63. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members meal  
13 period premiums for missed, late, and/or short meal periods pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b)  
14 and section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order.

15           64. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members an additional  
16 hour of pay for each day a compliant meal period was not provided, Plaintiff and Class Members  
17 suffered and continue to suffer a loss of wages and compensation.

#### 18                                   **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### 19                                   **FAILURE TO PERMIT REST BREAKS**

20                                   (Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7; Violation of IWC Wage Order § 12)

21           65. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as  
22 though fully set forth herein.

23           66. Labor Code § 226.7(a) provides that no employer shall require an employee to  
24 work during any rest period mandated by the IWC Wage Orders.

25           67. Section 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order states "[e]very employer shall  
26 authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the  
27 middle of each work period[,]" and the "[a]uthorized rest period time shall be based on the total  
28

1 hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction  
2 thereof[.]” unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3½) hours.

3 68. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive all ten  
4 (10) minute rest periods for every four (4) hours or major fraction thereof worked, including  
5 working in excess of ten (10) hours, because they were required to work through their rest periods  
6 and/or were not authorized to take their rest periods.

7 69. Labor Code § 226.7(b) and section 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order requires  
8 an employer to pay an employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of  
9 compensation for each work day that a compliant rest period is not provided.

10 70. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members rest  
11 period premiums for missed, late, and/or interrupted rest periods pursuant to Labor Code §  
12 226.7(b) and section 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order.

13 71. As a result of Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members an additional  
14 hour of pay for each day a compliant rest period was not provided, Plaintiff and Class Members  
15 suffered and continue to suffer a loss of wages and compensation.

16 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

18 (Violation of Labor Code §§ 2800, 2802)

19 72. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as  
20 though fully set forth herein.

21 73. Labor Code § 2800 states that “[a]n employer shall in all cases indemnify his  
22 employee for losses caused by the employer’s want of ordinary care.”

23 74. Labor Code § 2802(a) states that “[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her  
24 employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence  
25 of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer . .  
26 . .”

27 75. Labor Code § 2802(b) states that “[a]ll awards made by a court . . . for  
28 reimbursement of necessary expenditures under this section shall carry interest at the same rate as

1 judgments in civil actions. Interest shall accrue from the date on which the employee incurred the  
2 necessary expenditure or loss.”

3 76. Labor Code § 2802(c) states that “[f]or purposes of this section, the term “necessary  
4 expenditures or losses” shall include all reasonable costs, including, but not limited to, attorney’s  
5 fees incurred by the employee enforcing the rights granted by this section.”

6 77. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Class Members incurred necessary  
7 business-related costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants.

8 78. In violation of Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802, Defendants failed to reimburse or  
9 indemnify Plaintiff and Class Members for their expenses due to Defendants’ knowing and  
10 intentional failure to reimburse necessary business expenditures in connection with Plaintiff’s and  
11 Class Members’ work and job duties.

12 79. As a direct result, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered and continue to suffer  
13 losses, and therefore seek complete reimbursement and indemnification of necessary business  
14 expenditures or losses, interest thereon at the required rate, and all reasonable costs in enforcing  
15 the rights under Labor Code § 2802, including, but not limited to attorneys’ fees.

## 16 SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

### 17 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

18 (Violation of Labor Code § 226; Violation of IWC Wage Order)

19 80. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as  
20 though fully set forth herein.

21 81. Labor Code § 226(a) requires Defendants to provide each employee with an  
22 accurate wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including, the following:  
23 (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units  
24 earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions,  
25 provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown  
26 as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is  
27 paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or  
28 an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address

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

3 82. During the relevant time period, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally  
4 failed to comply with Labor Code § 226(a) on wage statements that were provided to Plaintiff and  
5 Class Members. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly state the  
6 gross and net wages earned, total hours worked, all applicable hourly rates in effect, and the  
7 number of hours worked at each hourly rate by Plaintiff and Class Members.

8 83. As a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional failure to comply with Labor  
9 Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-  
10 protected rights. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members are deemed to suffer an injury pursuant  
11 to Labor Code § 226(e) where, as here, Defendants intentionally violated Labor Code § 226(a).  
12 Plaintiff and Class Members were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected  
13 interest in receiving, accurate itemized wage statements under Labor Code § 226(a). In addition,  
14 because Defendants failed to provide the accurate rates of pay on wage statements, Defendants  
15 prevented Plaintiff and Class Members from determining if all hours worked were paid at the  
16 appropriate rate and the extent of the underpayment. Plaintiff had to file this lawsuit in order to  
17 analyze the extent of the underpayment, thereby causing Plaintiff to incur expenses and lost time.  
18 Plaintiff would not have had to engage in these efforts and incur these costs had Defendants  
19 provided the accurate hours worked, wages earned, and rates of pay. This has also delayed  
20 Plaintiff's ability to demand and recover the underpayment of wages from Defendants.

21 84. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of  
22 all actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a) or fifty  
23 dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred and one hundred dollars  
24 (\$100.00) per employee for each violation in subsequent pay periods in an amount not exceeding  
25 four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) per employee, plus attorneys' fees and costs.

26 85. Defendants' violations of California Labor Code § 226(a) prevented Plaintiff and  
27 Class Members from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wages paid to them and resulted  
28 in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a result of Defendants' knowing and

1 intentional failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and Class Members  
2 have suffered an injury, in the exact amount of damages and/or penalties to be shown according to  
3 proof at trial.

4 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES DUE UPON SEPARATION OF EMPLOYMENT**

6 (Violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203)

7 86. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as  
8 though fully set forth herein.

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

15 88. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to pay the Waiting  
16 Time Subclass all their earned wages upon termination, either at the time of discharge or within  
17 seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

18 89. Defendants' failure to pay the Waiting Time Subclass all their earned wages at the  
19 time of discharge or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ is in  
20 violation of Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

21 90. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed  
22 immediately upon discharge or resignation in accordance with Labor Code §§ 201 and 202, then  
23 the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date at the same rate until paid  
24 or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

25 91. Pursuant to Labor Code § 203, the Waiting Time Subclass is entitled to recover  
26 from Defendants the statutory penalty, which is defined as the Waiting Time Subclass members'  
27 regular daily wages at their regular hourly rate of pay for each day they were not paid, up to a  
28 maximum of thirty (30) days.

1 EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

2 **VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE §§ 17200, ET SEQ.**

3 (Violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)

4 92. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as  
5 though fully set forth herein.

6 93. California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, prohibits acts of unfair  
7 competition, which includes any “unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice . . . .”

8 94. A violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, may be  
9 predicated on a violation of any state or federal law. In the instant case, Defendants’ policies and  
10 practices violated state law, causing Plaintiff and Class Members to suffer and continue to suffer  
11 injuries-in-fact.

12 95. Defendants’ policies and practices violated state law in at least the following  
13 respects:

- 14 (a) Failing to pay all wages earned (including minimum wage and overtime  
15 wages) to Plaintiff and Class Members at the proper rate and in a timely  
16 manner in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198.
- 17 (b) Failing to provide compliant meal periods without paying Plaintiff and  
18 Class Members premium wages for every day said meal periods were not  
19 provided in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.
- 20 (c) Failing to authorize or permit compliant rest breaks without paying Plaintiff  
21 and Class Members premium wages for every day said rest breaks were not  
22 authorized or permitted in violation of Labor Code § 226.7.
- 23 (d) Failing to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for necessary business-  
24 related expenses in violation of Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802.
- 25 (e) Failing to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate itemized wage  
26 statements in violation of Labor Code § 226.

27 ///

28 ///

1 (f) Failing to timely pay all earned wages to the members of the Waiting Time  
2 Subclass upon separation of employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201,  
3 202, and 203.

4 96. As alleged herein, Defendants systematically engaged in unlawful conduct in  
5 violation of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, such as failing to pay all wages  
6 (minimum and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods and rest breaks or compensation  
7 in lieu thereof, failing to reimburse necessary business-related costs and expenses, failing to  
8 furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to pay all wages due and owing upon separation of  
9 employment in a timely manner to the Waiting Time Subclass, all in order to decrease their costs  
10 of doing business and increase their profits.

11 97. At all relevant times herein, Defendants held themselves out to Plaintiff and Class  
12 Members as being knowledgeable concerning the labor and employment laws of California.

13 98. At all times relevant herein, Defendants intentionally avoided paying Plaintiff and  
14 Class Members wages and monies, thereby creating for Defendants an artificially lower cost of  
15 doing business in order to undercut their competitors and establish and/or gain a greater foothold  
16 in the marketplace.

17 99. By violating the foregoing statutes and regulations as herein alleged, Defendants'  
18 acts constitute unfair and unlawful business practices under California Business and Professions  
19 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

20 100. As a result of the unfair and unlawful business practices of Defendants as alleged  
21 herein, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to injunctive relief, disgorgement, and restitution  
22 in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

23 101. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the  
24 meaning of California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein,  
25 has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, Class Members, and the  
26 general public. Based on Defendants' conduct as alleged herein, Plaintiff and Class Members are  
27 entitled to an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.  
28

1 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **ENFORCEMENT OF LABOR CODE §§ 2698 ET SEQ. ("PAGA")**

3 102. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporate by reference the previous paragraphs as  
4 though fully set forth herein.

5 103. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(a), any provision of the Labor Code that provides  
6 for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency  
7 ("LWDA") or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees for  
8 violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by  
9 an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees  
10 pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code § 2699.3.

11 104. For all provisions of the Labor Code except those for which a civil penalty is  
12 specifically provided, Labor Code § 2699(f) imposes upon Defendants a penalty of one hundred  
13 dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two  
14 hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent pay  
15 period in which Defendants violated these provisions of the Labor Code.

16 105. Defendants' conduct violates numerous Wage Order and Labor Code sections,  
17 including, but not limited to, the following:

- 18 a. violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 233, 246, 510,  
19 1182.12, 1194, 1197, and 1198 for failure to timely pay all earned wages  
20 at the correct rate of pay (including minimum wage, sick pay, and overtime  
21 wages) owed to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees during  
22 employment and upon separation of employment as herein alleged;
- 23 b. violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 for failure to provide meal  
24 periods to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees and failure to pay  
25 premium wages for missed meal periods as herein alleged;
- 26 c. violation of Labor Code § 226.7 for failure to permit rest breaks to Plaintiff  
27 and other aggrieved employees and failure to pay premium wages for  
28 missed rest periods as herein alleged;

- d. violation of Labor Code § 226 for failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as herein alleged;
- e. violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5 for failure to maintain accurate and complete records showing, among other things, the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to aggrieved employees; and
- f. violation of Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for necessary business expenses as herein alleged.

106. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” because he was employed by the alleged violator and had one or more of the violations committed against him, and therefore is properly suited to represent the interests of all other aggrieved employees.

107. Plaintiff has exhausted the procedural requirements under Labor Code § 2699.3 as to Defendants and is therefore able to pursue a claim for penalties on behalf of himself and all other aggrieved employees under PAGA.

108. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2699(a), 2699.3 and 2699.5, Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil penalties, in addition to other remedies, for violations of the Labor Code sections cited above.

109. For bringing this action, Plaintiff is entitled to attorney’s fees and costs incurred herein.

#### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

On Plaintiff’s own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. For certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 of the proposed Class and any other appropriate subclass;
2. For appointment of Jonathan Cruz Arizmendi as class representative;
3. For appointment of Aegis Law Firm, PC, as class counsel for all purposes;
4. For compensatory damages in an amount according to proof at trial;

1           5.       For an award of damages in the amount of unpaid compensation including, but not  
2 limited to, unpaid wages, unreimbursed expenses, benefits, and penalties;

3           6.       For economic and/or special damages in an amount according to proof at trial;

4           7.       For liquidated damages pursuant to Labor Code § 1194.2;

5           8.       For statutory penalties to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to  
6 the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;

7           9.       For injunctive relief as provided by the California Labor Code and California  
8 Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;

9           10.      For restitution as provided by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;

10          11.      For an order requiring Defendants to restore and disgorge all funds to each  
11 employee acquired by means of any act or practice declared by this Court to be unlawful, unfair,  
12 or fraudulent and, therefore, constituting unfair competition under Business and Professions Code  
13 §§ 17200, *et seq.*;

14          12.      For pre-judgment interest;


15          13.      For civil penalties;

16          14.      For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest to the extent permitted by  
17 law, including, but not limited to, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and Labor Code §§ 226(e),  
18 1194, and 2698 *et seq.*; and

19          15.      For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.  
20

21       Dated: March 11, 2026

**AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC**

22  
23       By: 

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jessica L. Campbell

24       Attorneys for Plaintiff Jonathan Cruz  
25       Arizmendi  
26  
27  
28