

MATERN LAW GROUP, PC
MATTHEW J. MATERN (SBN 159798)
mmatern@materlawgroup.com
DEANNA S. LEIFER (SBN 265840)
dleifer@maternlawgroup.com
2101 E. El Segundo Blvd., Suite 403
El Segundo, CA 90245
Telephone: (310) 531-1900
Facsimile: (310) 531-1901

MATERN LAW GROUP, PC
EMILY HYDE (SBN 359248)
ehyde@maternlawgroup.com
1330 Broadway, Suite 436
Oakland, CA 94612
Telephone: (310) 531-1900
Facsimile: (310) 531-1901

Attorneys for Plaintiff VALERY
BETZABETH NUNEZ VALENCIA, on
behalf of the aggrieved employees

Assigned for All Purposes:
Judge Melissa R. McCormick
Dept. CX105

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE

VALERY BETZABETH NUNEZ VALENCIA,
on behalf of the aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

HOLLYLEAF HEALTHCARE, INC. dba NEW
ORANGE HILLS, a Nevada corporation;
ORANGE COAST CARE, INC., a Nevada
corporation; THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC., a
Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendant.

CASE NO.: 30-2026-01553136-CU-OE-CXC

**COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF
THE CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT OF 2004**

[California Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.*]

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff Valery Betzabeth Nunez Valencia (“PLAINTIFF”), on behalf of the aggrieved
2 employees, alleges as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. PLAINTIFF brings this action on behalf of the aggrieved employees of defendants
5 HOLLYLEAF HEALTHCARE, INC. dba NEW ORANGE HILLS (“NEW ORANGE HILLS”), a
6 Nevada corporation; ORANGE COAST CARE, INC. (“ORANGE COAST CARE”), a Nevada
7 corporation; THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC. (“ENSIGN GROUP”), a Delaware corporation; and
8 DOES 1 through 50 inclusive (collectively, “DEFENDANTS”) in the State of California during
9 the relevant statutory period to recover penalties arising from DEFENDANTS’ failure to provide
10 employees meal and rest periods (or compensation therefor) as required under California law,
11 unpaid minimum and overtime wages, and wage statement violations.

12 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13 2. The Superior Court of the State of California has jurisdiction in this matter because
14 PLAINTIFF is a resident of the State of California, and DEFENDANTS are qualified to do
15 business in California and regularly conduct business in California. Further, no federal question is at
16 issue because the claim is based solely on California law.

17 3. Venue is proper in this judicial district and the County of Orange, California
18 because PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees performed work for DEFENDANTS in the
19 County of Orange, DEFENDANTS maintain offices and facilities and transact business in the
20 County of Orange, and DEFENDANTS’ illegal payroll policies and practices which are the
21 subject of this action were applied, at least in part, to PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees
22 in the County of Orange.

23 **PARTIES**

24 4. PLAINTIFF is a resident of the State of California. At times material to this
25 complaint, PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in the State of California as a non-
26 exempt employee. PLAINTIFF worked for DEFENDANTS as a Staffing Coordinator in Orange,
27 California from approximately November 1, 2021 to August 20, 2025.

28 5. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that NEW ORANGE

1 HILLS is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under the
2 laws of the State of Nevada. PLAINTIFF is further informed and believes, and thereon alleges,
3 that NEW ORANGE HILLS is authorized to conduct business in the State of California, and does
4 conduct business in, the State of California. Specifically, NEW ORANGE HILLS maintains
5 offices and facilities, conducts business, and engages in illegal payroll practices or policies in the
6 County of Orange.

7 6. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that ORANGE COAST
8 CARE is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under the
9 laws of the State of Nevada. PLAINTIFF is further informed and believes, and thereon alleges,
10 that ORANGE COAST CARE is authorized to conduct business in the State of California, and
11 does conduct business in, the State of California. Specifically, ORANGE COAST CARE
12 maintains offices and facilities, conducts business, and engages in illegal payroll practices or
13 policies in the County of Orange.

14 7. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that ENSIGN GROUP
15 is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the
16 State of Delaware. PLAINTIFF is further informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that
17 ENSIGN GROUP is authorized to conduct business in the State of California, and does conduct
18 business in, the State of California. Specifically, ENSIGN GROUP maintains offices and
19 facilities, conducts business, and engages in illegal payroll practices or policies in the County of
20 Orange.

21 8. The true names and capacities of DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are unknown to
22 PLAINTIFF at this time, and PLAINTIFF therefore sues such DOE defendants under fictitious
23 names. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each defendant
24 designated as a DOE is in some manner highly responsible for the occurrences alleged herein, and
25 that PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees' injuries and damages, as alleged herein, were
26 proximately caused by the conduct of such DOE defendants. PLAINTIFF will seek leave of the
27 court to amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities of such DOE defendants
28 when ascertained.

1 9. At all relevant times herein, DEFENDANTS were the joint employers of
2 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon
3 alleges, that at all relevant times DEFENDANTS were the alter egos, divisions, affiliates,
4 integrated enterprises, joint employers, subsidiaries, parents, principals, related entities, co-
5 conspirators, authorized agents, partners, joint venturers, and/or guarantors, actual or ostensible,
6 of each other. Each defendant was completely dominated by his, her or its co-defendant, and
7 each was the alter ego of the other.

8 10. At all relevant times herein, PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees were
9 employed by DEFENDANTS under employment agreements that were partly written, partly oral,
10 and partly implied. In perpetrating the acts and omissions alleged herein, DEFENDANTS, and
11 each of them, acted pursuant to, and in furtherance of, their policies and practices of not paying
12 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees all wages earned and due, through methods and
13 schemes which include, but are not limited to, failing to provide meal periods; failing to authorize
14 and permit rest breaks; failing to pay minimum and overtime wages; failing to provide accurate
15 itemized statements; failing to properly maintain records; and failing to properly compensate
16 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees for necessary expenditures, in violation of the
17 California Labor Code ("Labor Code") and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission
18 ("IWC") Wage Order.

19 11. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and every one
20 of the acts and omissions alleged herein were performed by, and/or attributable to, all
21 DEFENDANTS, each acting as agents and/or employees, and/or under the direction and control
22 of, each of the other DEFENDANTS, and that said acts and failures to act were within the course
23 and scope of said agency, employment and/or direction and control.

24 12. As a direct and proximate result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful actions,
25 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees have suffered, and continue to suffer, from loss of
26 earnings in amounts as yet unascertained, but subject to proof at trial, and within the jurisdiction
27 of this Court.

28 ///

1 **PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

2 13. Pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”), Labor
3 Code §§ 2698-2699.5, PLAINTIFF brings this action on behalf of all current and former non-
4 exempt aggrieved employees of DEFENDANTS in the State of California at any time within the
5 period beginning one (1) year and sixty-five (65) days prior to the filing of this action, and ending
6 at the time this action settles or proceeds to final judgment (“PENALTY PERIOD”).

7 14. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699.3, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by
8 online filing on December 22, 2025 to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
9 (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to DEFENDANTS of the specific provisions of the California
10 Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories
11 to support the alleged violations. More than sixty-five (65) days have passed and the LWDA has
12 not provided notice to PLAINTIFF that it intends to investigate the alleged violations.

13 15. Therefore, PLAINTIFF has complied with all of the requirements set forth in
14 California Labor Code § 2699.3 to commence a representative action under PAGA.

15 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

16 **Failure to Provide Required Meal Periods**

17 **[Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512; IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 11]**

18 16. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS have had, and continue to have,
19 a policy and practice of failing to provide PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees full and
20 timely meal periods as required by California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and IWC Wage
21 Order No. 5-2001 § 11.

22 17. As a result of DEFENDANTS’ policies and practices as alleged herein,
23 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees have regularly been denied, and continue to be
24 denied, the opportunity to take full, uninterrupted, and timely meal periods as required under
25 California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 11.

26 18. DEFENDANTS have further violated, and continue to violate, Labor Code §§
27 226.7 and 512 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 11 by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and
28 other aggrieved employees who were not provided with a meal period, in accordance with the

1 applicable Wage Order, one (1) additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate
2 of pay for each workday that a meal period was not provided.

3 **Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods**

4 **[Labor Code §§ 226.7; IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 12]**

5 19. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS have had, and continue to have,
6 a policy and practice of failing to authorize and permit PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved
7 employees to take rest breaks as required by California Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order
8 No. 5-2001 § 12. As a result of DEFENDANTS' policies and practices as alleged herein,
9 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees have regularly been denied, and continue to be
10 denied, the opportunity to take full, uninterrupted, and timely rest periods as required under
11 California Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 12.

12 20. DEFENDANTS have further violated, and continue to violate, California Labor
13 Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 12 by failing to pay PLAINTIFF and other
14 aggrieved employees who were not provided with a rest period, in accordance with the applicable
15 Wage Order, one (1) additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for
16 each workday that a rest period was not authorized and permitted.

17 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

18 **[Cal. Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197; IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 4]**

19 21. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-
20 2001 § 4, payment to an employee of less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours
21 worked in a payroll period is unlawful.

22 22. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and
23 other aggrieved employees minimum wages for all hours worked by, among other things:
24 requiring, suffering or permitting PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees to work off the
25 clock; requiring, suffering or permitting PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees to work
26 through meal breaks without compensation; rounding PLAINTIFF's and other aggrieved
27 employees' clock-in and clock-out times in a manner that resulted, over time, in failure to
28 compensate employees for all time worked; illegally and inaccurately recording time in which

1 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees worked; and other methods to be discovered.

2 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

3 **[Cal. Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198; IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 3]**

4 23. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-
5 2001 § 3, DEFENDANTS are required to compensate PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved
6 employees for all overtime at a rate of one and one-half (1 ½) times the regular rate of pay for all
7 hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week, and for the
8 first eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive workday and at a rate of twice the regular rate of
9 pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in any workday and for all hours worked
10 in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in any workweek.

11 24. PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees are current and former non-exempt
12 employees entitled to the protections of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194 and IWC Wage
13 Order No. 5-2001. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed to compensate, and
14 continue to fail to compensate, PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees for all overtime hours
15 worked as required under the foregoing provisions of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
16 Order by, among other things: failing to pay overtime at one and one-half (1 ½) times or double
17 the regular rate of pay as provided by California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194 and IWC Wage
18 Order No. 5-2001 § 3; requiring, suffering or permitting PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved
19 employees to work off the clock; requiring, suffering or permitting PLAINTIFF and other
20 aggrieved employees to work through meal breaks without compensation; rounding
21 PLAINTIFF's and other aggrieved employees' clock-in and clock-out times in a manner that
22 resulted, over time, in failure to compensate employees for all time worked; failing to properly
23 calculate the regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating overtime compensation; illegally and
24 inaccurately recording time in which PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees worked; and
25 other methods to be discovered.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment**

2 **[Cal. Labor Code § 204]**

3 25. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 204, for all labor performed between the 1st
4 and 15th days of any calendar month, DEFENDANTS are required to pay their nonexempt
5 employees between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed.
6 California Labor Code § 204 also provides that for all labor performed between the 16th and 26th
7 days of any calendar month, DEFENDANTS are required to pay their nonexempt employees
8 between the 1st and 10th day of the following calendar month. In addition, California Labor
9 Code § 204 provides that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be
10 paid no later than the payday of the next regular payroll period.

11 26. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed to timely pay
12 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees all the wages for labor performed by the next regular
13 payroll period as required by California Labor Code § 204.

14 **Failure to Pay All Wages Due to Discharged and Quitting Employees**

15 **[Cal. Labor Code §§ 201, 202]**

16 27. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202, DEFENDANTS are required
17 to timely pay all earned and unpaid wages to an employee upon separation.

18 28. California Labor Code § 201 mandates that if an employer discharges an
19 employee, the employee's wages accrued and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable
20 immediately.

21 29. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 202, DEFENDANTS are required to pay all
22 accrued wages due to an employee no later than 72 hours after the employee quits his or her
23 employment, unless the employee provided 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to
24 quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

25 30. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed, and continue to fail, to
26 pay accrued wages and other compensation to PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees in
27 accordance with California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

28 ///

1 **Failure to Maintain Required Records**

2 **[Cal. Labor Code §§ 226, 1174; IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 7]**

3 31. During the PENALTY PERIOD, as part of DEFENDANTS' illegal payroll
4 policies and practices to deprive PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees of all wages earned
5 and due, DEFENDANTS failed to maintain records as required under California Labor Code §§
6 226 and 1174 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 7, including but not limited to the following
7 records: total daily hours worked by each employee; applicable rates of pay; all deductions; meal
8 periods; time records showing when each employee begins and ends each work period; and
9 accurate itemized statements.

10 **Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

11 **[Cal. Labor Code § 226; IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 7]**

12 32. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF
13 and other aggrieved employees with timely and accurate itemized wage statements in writing
14 showing each employee's gross wages earned, total hours worked, all deductions made, net
15 wages earned, the name and address of the legal entity or entities employing PLAINTIFF and
16 other aggrieved employees, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during each pay period and
17 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in violation of California Labor
18 Code § 226 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 7.

19 **Failure to Indemnify Employees for Necessary Expenditures Incurred in Discharge of**
20 **Duties**

21 **[Cal. Labor Code § 2802]**

22 33. California Labor Code § 2802(a) requires an employer to indemnify an employee
23 for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the
24 discharge of her his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

25 34. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed to indemnify PLAINTIFF
26 and other aggrieved employees for all business expenses and/or losses incurred in direct
27 consequence of the discharge of their duties while working under the direction of
28 DEFENDANTS, including but not limited to expenses for cell phones, in violation of California

1 Labor Code § 2802.

2 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

3 **REPRESENTATIVE ACTION FOR CIVIL PENALTIES**

4 **[Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.*]**

5 **(Against All DEFENDANTS)**

6
7 35. PLAINTIFF incorporates herein by specific reference as though fully set forth the
8 allegations in the preceding paragraphs.

9 36. PLAINTIFF is an “aggrieved employee” within the meaning of California Labor
10 Code § 2699(c), and a proper representative to bring a civil action on behalf of other current and
11 former employees of DEFENDANTS pursuant to the procedures specified in California Labor
12 Code § 2699.3, because PLAINTIFF and the aggrieved employees were employed by
13 DEFENDANTS and one or more of the alleged violations of the California Labor Code were
14 committed against PLAINTIFF and the aggrieved employees during the PENALTY PERIOD.

15 37. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2698-2699.5, PLAINTIFF seeks to recover civil
16 penalties from DEFENDANTS in a representative action for the violations set forth above,
17 including but not limited to violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510,
18 512, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, and 1198. PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees are also
19 entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code
20 § 2699(g)(1).

21 38. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(a), PLAINTIFF seeks civil penalties for
22 DEFENDANTS’ violations of Labor Code provisions for which a civil penalty is specifically
23 provided, including but not limited to the following:

- 24 a. Pursuant to Labor Code § 210, for violations of Labor Code § 204,
25 DEFENDANTS are subject to a civil penalty in the amount of one hundred
26 dollars (\$100) for the initial violation for each failure to pay each employee
27 and two hundred dollars (\$200) per employee for violations in subsequent
28 pay periods.

- b. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3, for violations of Labor Code § 226(a), DEFENDANTS are subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) per aggrieved employee for the initial pay period where a violation occurs and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per aggrieved employee for violations in subsequent pay periods.
- c. Pursuant to Labor Code § 558(a), “[a]ny employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission,” including Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, shall be subject to a civil penalty, in addition to any other penalty provided by law, of fifty dollars (\$50) for initial violations for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each subsequent violation for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid.
- d. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, for violations of Labor Code § 1174(d), DEFENDANTS are subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).
- e. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1, an employer who pays or causes to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an order of the commission, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: for any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is underpaid; and for each subsequent violation of the same offense, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation was intentionally committed.

39. Labor Code § 2699(f) provides that for all Labor Code violations for which a civil

1 penalty is not specifically provided, the following civil penalties are established: one hundred
2 dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two
3 hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.
4 PLAINTIFF seeks such civil penalties under Labor Code § 2699(f) for DEFENDANTS'
5 violations of Labor Code provisions for which a civil penalty is not specifically provided,
6 including but not limited to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226.7, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2802.

7
8 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

9 **WHEREFORE**, PLAINTIFF, on behalf of the aggrieved employees, respectfully prays
10 for relief against DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, and each of them, as
11 follows:

- 12 1. For statutory and civil penalties according to proof, including but not limited to all
13 penalties authorized by Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699(a) and (f);
- 14 2. For interest at the legal rate pursuant to Labor Code §§ 218.6 and 1194, California
15 Civil Code §§ 3287, 3288, and/or any other applicable provision providing for pre-judgment
16 interest;
- 17 3. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g) and/or
18 any other applicable provisions providing for attorneys' fees and costs; and
- 19 4. For such further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

20 DATED: March 9, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

21 **MATERN LAW GROUP, PC**

22
23 By: 

24 MATTHEW J. MATERN
25 DEANNA S. LEIFER
26 EMILY HYDE
27 Attorneys for Plaintiff VALERY
28 BETZABETH NUNEZ VALENCIA, on
behalf of the aggrieved employees

1 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

2 PLAINTIFF hereby demands a jury trial with respect to all issues triable of right by jury.

3
4 DATED: March 9, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

5 **MATERN LAW GROUP, PC**

6
7 By:



8 MATTHEW J. MATERN

9 DEANNA S. LEIFER

10 EMILY HYDE

Attorneys for Plaintiff VALERY

11 BETZABETH NUNEZ VALENCIA, on

12 behalf of the aggrieved employees