

1 Daniel J. Hyun (State Bar No. 309184)
2 dhyun@arisllp.com
3 Shelly Song (State Bar No. 312036)
4 ssong@arisllp.com
5 Shaheen Anthony Etemadi (SBN 319138)
6 setemadi@arisllp.com
7 **ARIS LLP**
8 1 Park Plaza, Ste. 600
9 Irvine, CA 92614
10 Telephone: 949.807.4467
11 Facsimile: 949.807.4469

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff Mauricio Perez

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT
2/25/2026 9:08 PM
By: Aryanna Sheehee, DEPUTY

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

MAURICIO PEREZ, an individual, on behalf of
himself and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

KNOBLE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY LLC;
and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CIVSB2608416

**CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE
ACTION COMPLAINT**

1. Failure to Pay All Wages;
2. Failure to Provide Meal Periods or Compensation;
3. Failure to Permit Rest Periods or Provide Compensation;
4. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
5. Waiting Time Penalties;
6. Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses;
7. Violation of the Unfair Competition Law; and
8. Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
PUBLIC INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
REQUESTED**

1 Plaintiff Mauricio Perez (“Plaintiff”), individually, and on behalf of all others similarly
2 situated, brings this Class and Representative Action Complaint (“Complaint”) against Defendants
3 Knoble Construction Company LLC, and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive (collectively, “Defendants”),
4 and alleges as follows:

5 **INTRODUCTION**

6 1. Plaintiff brings this putative class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
7 382 against Defendants, on behalf of himself individually and a putative class of all current and former
8 non-exempt employees employed by Defendants in California during the Class Period (collectively
9 the “Class” or “Class Members”). The term Class Period is defined as four (4) years prior to the filing
10 of this action through the date of class certification.

11 2. Plaintiff also brings this representative action pursuant to the PAGA, Labor Code
12 sections 2698 *et seq.*, against Defendants, on behalf of himself individually and other aggrieved
13 employees who are and were employed by Defendants throughout California during the PAGA Period.
14 The term PAGA Period is defined as one (1) year prior to Plaintiff’s notice of Labor Code violations
15 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendants until judgment.

16 3. Defendant Knoble Construction Company LLC is a licensed California contractor.

17 4. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have engaged in a systematic pattern of wage and hour
18 violations under the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage
19 Orders, and California Business and Professions Code that have damaged Plaintiff and Class
20 Members, and contribute to Defendants’ deliberate unfair competition.

21 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants have violated
22 and continue to violate state wage and hour laws by, among other things:

- 23 (a) failing to pay all wages (including minimum, regular, overtime, double time, and
24 prevailing wages);
- 25 (b) failing to provide lawful meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof;
- 26 (c) failing to authorize or permit rest breaks or provide compensation in lieu thereof;
- 27 (d) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements;
- 28 (e) failure to reimburse business expenses; and

1 (f) failing to pay all wages due upon separation of employment.

2 6. Plaintiff seeks monetary relief against Defendants on behalf of himself, the putative
3 class, aggrieved employees, and the State of California to recover, among other things, unpaid wages,
4 liquidated damages, restitution, injunctive relief, interest, attorneys' fees, costs, and penalties pursuant
5 to Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 206, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 256, 510, 512, 558, 1174,
6 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1771, 1774, 1776, 1811, 1815, 2800, 2802, and 2804, IWC Wage
7 Order 16, and California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5.

8 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

9 7. This is a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 and
10 representative action pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2698 *et seq.* ("PAGA"). The monetary
11 damages, restitution, penalties, and other amounts sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal
12 jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

13 8. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution,
14 Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes, except those
15 given by statutes to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any
16 other basis for jurisdiction. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff
17 seeks relief authorized by California law.

18 9. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and belief,
19 they have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of
20 the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts
21 consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

22 10. Venue is proper in this Court under Code of Civil Procedure Sections 395(a) and 395.5
23 because, upon information and belief, Defendants reside, transact business, maintain offices, and/or
24 have an agent or agents in this county, and the acts and omissions alleged herein took place in this
25 county.

26 **PARTIES**

27 11. Plaintiff is a California citizen and a resident of San Bernardino County. Defendants
28 employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee during the Class Period. During his employment with

1 Defendants, Plaintiff's job duties consisted of, *inter alia*, construction and demolition, lifting heavy
2 blocks, pushing wheelbarrows full of concrete, making wooden frames to give form to the concrete,
3 lifting debris over 200-300 pounds, and general labor. Plaintiff worked for Defendants on private and
4 public works projects. Plaintiff's employment with Defendants ended within one (1) year of the filing
5 of this action.

6 12. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times Defendant
7 Knoble Construction Company LLC ("KCC") was and is a California limited liability company.
8 Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that KCC's principal place of business is located at
9 1612 Bellevue Road, Redlands, CA 92373. Plaintiff is further informed, believes and thereon alleges
10 that, at all relevant times, KCC regularly conducted and conducts business within the State of
11 California and derives substantial revenues from services performed in California. Plaintiff is
12 informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, KCC was and is an employer subject
13 to California state wage and hour laws. According to the California Department of Industrial Relations,
14 KCC is a licensed public works contractor (Public Works Contractor Registration # 1000909922).

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

18 14. Defendants continue to employ non-exempt employees within California.

19 15. Defendant DOES 1 through 50, are sued under fictitious names pursuant to Code of
20 Civil Procedure Section 474 because Plaintiff does not know their true names or capacities. Plaintiff
21 will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint and serve such fictitiously named Defendants when
22 their names and capacities are ascertained.

23 16. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DOES 1 through 50 are or
24 were the partners, agents, owners, shareholders, managers, or employees of Defendants at all relevant
25 times.

26 17. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each Defendant acted in all
27 respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendant, carried out a joint scheme, business
28 plan, or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable

1 to the other Defendants.

2 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each Defendant directly or
3 indirectly, through agents or other persons or entities, employed or otherwise exercised control over
4 the wages, hours, and working conditions of Plaintiff. Furthermore, each Defendant in all respects
5 acted as the employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and the Class Members.

6 19. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and all of the acts and
7 omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to, Defendants and/or DOES 1 through
8 50, acting as the agent, alter ego, agent, servant, joint venturer, co-conspirator, and/or partner for the
9 other, within a common enterprise and legal authority to act on the other's behalf. The acts of any and
10 all Defendants were in accordance with, and represent, the official policy of Defendants.

11 20. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, acted within the scope of such
12 agency or employment, or ratified each and every act or omission complained of herein. At all relevant
13 times, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of each and all the other
14 Defendants in proximately causing the damages herein alleged.

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

18 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

19 22. Plaintiff brings this class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 on
20 behalf of himself and all others similarly situated who were injured by Defendants' violations of the
21 Labor Code, Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*, and IWC Wage Orders during
22 the Class Period.

23 23. Plaintiff's proposed Class consists of and is defined as follows:

24 Class

25 All current and former non-exempt employees employed by Defendants in the state of
26 California within four (4) years prior to the commencement of this action to the date of
27 class certification.

28 24. Plaintiff also seeks to certify the following Subclass:

Waiting Time Subclass

All Class Members who separated from their employment with Defendants at any time within three (3) years prior to the filing of this action to the date of class certification (“Subclass” or “Waiting Time Subclass”).

25. Members of the Class and Subclass described above will be collectively referred to as “Class Members.”

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

27. There is a well-defined community of interest in this litigation and the proposed Class and Subclass are readily ascertainable.

28. **Commonality:** This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action under the California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 because there are common questions of law and fact as to the Class Members that predominate over any questions affecting only individual members including, but not limited to, the following:

- (a) Whether Defendants paid Plaintiff and Class Members all wages (including minimum, regular, overtime, double time, and prevailing wages) for all hours worked;
- (b) Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to work off-the-clock without compensation;
- (c) Whether Defendants provided Plaintiff and Class Members with compliant meal periods or paid compensation in lieu thereof;
- (d) Whether Defendants authorized and permitted compliant rest breaks to Plaintiff and Class Members or paid compensation in lieu thereof;
- (e) Whether Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate itemized wage statements;
- (f) Whether Defendants failed to timely pay Class Members all wages due immediately upon termination or within 72 hours of resignation;
- (g) Whether Defendants failed to reimburse business expenses;

- 1 (h) Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless; and
2 (i) Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of Business and
3 Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*

4 29. There is a well-defined community of interest. Further, Plaintiff and Class Members
5 have suffered common injuries as a result of Defendants' systemic employment policies and practices.
6 Looking to Defendants' employment policies and practices, the Court can adjudicate the lawfulness
7 of those policies and practices on a class-wide basis, according to proof, and issue an award to Plaintiff
8 and Class Members accordingly. In addition, answers to common questions raised in this Complaint
9 will advance resolution of each individual Class Member's claims.

10 30. **Numerosity:** The Class Members are so numerous that joinder of all members is
11 impractical. Although the members of the entire Class and Subclass are unknown to Plaintiff at this
12 time, on information and belief, the class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals.

13 31. **Ascertainability:** The identities of the Class Members are readily ascertainable by
14 inspection of Defendants' employment and payroll records.

15 32. **Typicality:** The claims (or defenses, if any) of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the
16 Class Members because Defendants' failure to comply with the provisions of California's wage and
17 hour laws entitled each Class Member to similar pay, benefits, and other relief. The injuries sustained
18 by Plaintiff are also typical of the injuries sustained by Class Members because they arise out of and
19 are caused by Defendants' common course of conduct as alleged herein.

20 33. **Adequacy:** Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of all
21 Class Members because it is in Plaintiff's best interest to prosecute the claims alleged herein to obtain
22 full compensation and penalties due to Plaintiff and the Class Members. Plaintiff's attorneys, as
23 proposed class counsel, are competent and experienced in litigating large employment class actions
24 and versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has
25 incurred and, throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur attorneys' fees and costs
26 that have been and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial
27 benefit of the Class Members.

28 34. **Superiority:** The nature of this action makes use of class action adjudication superior

to other methods. A class action will achieve economies of time, effort, and expense as compared with separate lawsuits and will avoid inconsistent outcomes because the same issues can be adjudicated in the same manner for the entire Class and Subclass at the same time. If appropriate, this Court can, and is empowered to, fashion methods to efficiently manage this case as a class action.

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

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

36. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other persons as non-exempt employees at Defendants' locations within California. Defendants employed Plaintiff in a non-exempt position during his employment and continue to employ Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees within California.

37. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein mentioned, Defendants were advised by skilled lawyers, employees, and other professionals who were knowledgeable about California's wage and hour laws, employment and personnel practices, and the requirements of California law.

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

39. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive at least minimum wages, wages at their regular rate of pay, overtime, double time, and prevailing wages, and that they were not receiving minimum, regular, overtime, double time, and prevailing wages for all work that was

1 required to be performed. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Plaintiff and
2 Class Members regularly worked in excess of eight (8) hours per workday, 10 hours per workday, 12
3 hours per workday, and/or over 40 hours per workweek. Specifically, Defendants required Plaintiff
4 and Class Members to provide their own equipment and tools necessary to perform their job duties,
5 but failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members at least two times the minimum wage in violation of
6 Wage Order 16, § 8. Specifically, Defendants required Plaintiff to use his own tools and equipment to
7 perform his job duties, including saw, hammer, drill, bars, etc., but only paid Plaintiff \$23/hour (i.e.,
8 less than two times the minimum wage). Defendants also failed to maintain accurate timekeeping
9 records. Rather than maintaining accurate records of Plaintiff and Class Members' hours worked,
10 Defendants' managers would simply tell Plaintiff and Class Members how many hours they worked
11 at the end of their shifts. This unlawful timekeeping practice/policy failed to accurately track the
12 correct number of hours that Plaintiff and Class Members worked and/or were subject to Defendants'
13 control on any given workday, including time spent before and after their scheduled 8-hour shifts, and
14 time spent performing work during time periods otherwise allotted for purported meal periods,
15 resulting in unpaid minimum and overtime wages owed. Further, Defendants called and texted
16 Plaintiff and Class Members both before and after their scheduled shifts, including sending messages
17 regarding their job duties and availability. Defendants also failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members
18 prevailing wages for all hours they worked on public works projects, including, but not limited to, all
19 hours he was subject to the control of Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work. As such,
20 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other Class Members minimum, regular, overtime, double time,
21 and prevailing wages for all hours worked in violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

22 40. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
23 have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive a timely, off-duty, uninterrupted
24 30-minute meal period for every five (5) hours of work, or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay
25 at their regular rate of pay when they did not receive a compliant meal period. In violation of the Labor
26 Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members had their meal periods missed, late,
27 interrupted, rounded, shortened, automatically deducted, on-duty, and/or restricted to the worksite due
28 to Defendants' work demands, understaffing, policies, and practices. For example, on those occasions

1 when Plaintiff and Class Members were able to take a meal period, Plaintiff and Class Members were
2 unable to commence their meal periods until after the completion of five hours of work due to work
3 demands (including pouring concrete) and understaffing. Plaintiff's meal periods were also cut short
4 as Plaintiff and Class Members were regularly interrupted with emergent work issues and expected to
5 respond during their meal periods. Further, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members
6 with compliant second meal periods when their shifts exceeded 10 hours. Defendants failed to
7 compensate Plaintiff and other Class Members with an additional hour of pay at their regular rate for
8 every day in which they suffered a meal period violation. As such, Defendants failed to provide
9 Plaintiff and other Class Members all required meal periods or premium pay, in violation of the Labor
10 Code and IWC Wage Orders.

11 41. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
12 have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive a 10-minute, off-duty,
13 uninterrupted rest period for every four (4) hours worked, or major fraction thereof, or payment of one
14 (1) additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when they were not permitted to take a compliant
15 rest period. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Defendants failed to provide
16 compliant rest breaks to Plaintiff and Class Members due to their excessive work demands,
17 understaffing, policies, and practices as mentioned above. As such, Plaintiff and Class Members
18 regularly had their rest breaks missed, shortened, late, on-duty, restricted to the worksite, and/or
19 interrupted. Specifically, Defendants did not authorize or permit Plaintiff and Class Members to take
20 any rest periods, regardless of shift length. Thus, Plaintiff and Class Members regularly had their rest
21 periods missed, shortened, late, on-duty, restricted to the worksite, and/or interrupted. In addition,
22 Defendants failed to provide rest periods during the middle of each work period. Moreover,
23 Defendants failed to authorize or permit Plaintiff and Class Members to take third rest periods when
24 their shifts exceeded 10 hours. Further, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and other Class
25 Members with an additional hour of pay at their regular rate for every day in which they suffered a
26 rest period violation. As such, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other Class Members all
27 required rest periods or premium pay, in violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

28 42. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that during the Class Period,

1 Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for all necessary business expenses
2 incurred for Defendants' benefit. For example, Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to
3 use their personal cell phones to communicate with supervisors about their work duties. Further,
4 Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for the use of their personal safety
5 equipment (e.g., facemask, gloves, belt, helmet, etc.) to perform their job duties. Moreover,
6 Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for the use of their personal tools (e.g.,
7 saw, hammer, drill, bars, etc.) to perform their job duties. Accordingly, Defendants violated the Labor
8 Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders.

9 43. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
10 have known that Waiting Time Subclass Members who separated from their employment with
11 Defendants during the statutory period were entitled to timely payment of all wages due. In violation
12 of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Waiting Time Class Members did not receive payment of
13 all wages owed upon separation within the permissible time period due to, *inter alia*, Defendants'
14 failure to pay all wages including minimum, straight time, overtime, double time, and prevailing
15 wages, reimbursements, and failure to pay meal and rest period premiums to Class Members.

16 44. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants knew or should
17 have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive complete and accurate wage
18 statements. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members were
19 not furnished with complete and accurate wage statements that show all of the information required
20 by Labor Code Section 226, including, but not limited to, the gross and net wages earned, the total
21 hours worked, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, and the corresponding number
22 of hours worked at each hourly rate.

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES**

25 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

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

28 46. At all times herein relevant, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Sections

1 204, 206, 510, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and all applicable
2 local minimum wage ordinances in effect throughout California.

3 47. Labor Code Section 204 and the IWC Wage Orders require timely payment of all
4 wages owed on regularly scheduled paydays at least twice during each calendar month, on days
5 designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays. All wages in earned in excess of the
6 normal work period must be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period.

7 48. Labor Code Section 206 provides that in case of a dispute over wages, the employer
8 shall pay, without condition and promptly under the Labor Code all wages conceded due, leaving to
9 the employee all remedies he/she is otherwise entitled to as to any balance claimed.

10 49. The IWC Wage Orders define “hours worked” as “the time during which an employee
11 is subject to the control of an employer and includes all time the employee is suffered or permitted to
12 work, whether or not required to do so.”

13 50. Labor Code Section 510 and the IWC Wage Orders require that employers pay
14 employees for all overtime hours at a rate of one and one-half times the employee’s regular rate of pay
15 for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one (1) workday, 40 hours in one (1) workweek, and
16 after the first eight hours on the seventh consecutive workday in one (1) workweek. Labor Code
17 Section 510 and the IWC Wage Orders further require that employers pay employees double their
18 regular rate of pay for hours work in excess of 12 hours in a workday and after eight hours on the
19 seventh consecutive workday in one (1) workweek. Labor Code Section 510 requires payment of
20 overtime wages at one and one half times the “regular rate of pay,” which includes all forms of
21 remuneration earned by the employee.

22 51. Labor Code Section 1182.12 sets forth the minimum hourly wage that must be paid to
23 all employees in California for all hours worked. Local minimum wage ordinances, may provide for
24 higher minimum wage rates that must be paid to employees for all hours worked in those locales where
25 each local ordinance is in effect. Labor Code Section 1197 affirms that it is unlawful to pay less than
26 the state or local minimum wage, whichever is higher, for any hour of work.

27 52. Labor Code Section 1194 requires that employers pay employees at least the legal
28 minimum wage rate for all hours worked, notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage.

1 Labor Code Section 1194 further authorizes any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage
2 applicable to the employee to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of wages,
3 along with interest thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

4 53. Labor Code Section 1194.2 authorizes the recovery of liquidated damages in an amount
5 equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon for unpaid wage violations.

6 54. Labor Code Section 1198 prohibits employers from employing for longer hours or less
7 favorable conditions than those set forth in the Labor Code, IWC Wage Orders, or as otherwise set by
8 the Labor Commissioner.

9 55. Labor Code Sections 1771 and 1774 require contractors and subcontractors on public
10 works projects to pay their workers no less than the specified general prevailing rate of wages. These
11 prevailing wage rates are determined by the California Department of Industrial Relations and include
12 a basic hourly rate plus fringe benefits, and they must be paid for all hours worked on the project.
13 Labor Code Sections 1811 and 1815 allow for work on public works projects to exceed 8 hours a day
14 and 40 hours a week, but requires that any hours worked beyond these limits must be compensated at
15 a rate of not less than 1.5 times the regular rate of pay.

16 56. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members
17 all wages due, including for off-the-clock work, among other things.

18 57. During the relevant time period, Defendants also failed to conform their pay practices
19 to the requirements of the law by failing to pay prevailing wages to Plaintiff and Class Members for
20 all hours worked on public works projects, including, but not limited to, all hours they were subject to
21 the control of Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work.

22 58. In violation of California law, Defendants have knowingly and willfully refused to
23 perform their obligations and compensate Plaintiff and Class Members for all wages earned as alleged
24 above.

25 59. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members all earned minimum, regular,
26 overtime, double time, and prevailing wages in accordance with Labor Code Sections 204, 206, 510,
27 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1771, 1774, 1811, and 1815, the applicable IWC Wage Orders,
28 and all applicable local minimum wage ordinances in effect throughout California, Plaintiff and Class

1 Members are entitled to recover the full amount of unpaid wages, liquidated damages, prejudgment
2 interest, and statutory penalties, along with attorneys' fees and costs in amounts that will be established
3 at trial.

4 60. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants, through their
5 conduct described herein, have committed an "intentional theft of wages in an amount greater than
6 nine hundred fifty dollars (\$950) from any one employee, or two thousand three hundred fifty dollars
7 (\$2,350) in the aggregate from two or more employees...in any consecutive 12-month period" within
8 the meaning of California Penal Code section 487m. Specifically, Defendants have intentionally
9 deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of wages, as defined in Labor Code section 200, gratuities, as
10 defined in Labor Code section 350, benefits, or other compensation, by unlawful means, with the
11 knowledge that the wages, gratuities, benefits, or other compensation is due to Plaintiff and Class
12 Members under the law. Plaintiff and the Class Members he seeks to represent are thus entitled to
13 recover from Defendants treble damages and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to
14 California Penal Code section 496(c).

15 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

17 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

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

20 62. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Sections 226.7
21 and 512, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

22 63. Labor Code Section 512 and the IWC Wage Orders prohibit an employer from
23 employing any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the
24 employee with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes (commencing before the employee's fifth
25 hour of work), except that if the total work period per day is no more than six (6) hours, the meal
26 period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee. A second meal period of not
27 less than 30 minutes is required if an employee works more than 10 hours per day and must begin
28 before the employee's tenth hour of work, except if the total hours worked is no more than 12 hours,

1 the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee, but only if
2 the first meal period was not waived. An employer must relieve an employee of all duties during meal
3 periods.

4 64. The applicable IWC Wage Orders state that “[u]nless the employee is relieved of all
5 duty during a 30-minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an ‘on duty’ meal period
6 and counted as time worked.”

7 65. Labor Code Section 226.7(b) and the IWC Wage Orders prohibit an employer from
8 requiring any employee to work during a meal period mandated by any California statute, regulation,
9 standard or order. If an employer fails to provide an employee with a meal period in accordance with
10 state law, Labor Code Section 226.7(c) and the IWC Wage Orders require that the employer pay the
11 employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each
12 workday that the meal period is noncompliant.

13 66. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive compliant
14 meal periods at the required time intervals. Specifically, meal periods were late, interrupted, rounded,
15 auto-deducted, on-duty, short, missed, and/or restricted to the worksite.

16 67. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members
17 meal period premiums for noncompliant meal periods pursuant to Labor Code Section 226.7(b) and
18 the applicable IWC Wage Order.

19 68. As a result of Defendants’ failure to provide compliant meal periods and pay meal
20 period premiums to Plaintiff and Class Members in accordance with the IWC Wage Orders and Labor
21 Code Sections 226.7 and 512, Plaintiff and Class Members suffered and continue to suffer a loss of
22 wages and compensation.

23 69. Because Plaintiff and Class Members were and/or are entitled to such meal periods or
24 “premium pay” in lieu thereof, they are entitled to such payment per shift in an amount according to
25 proof. To the extent such unpaid premiums are deemed unpaid wages, Plaintiff will also seek pre- and
26 post-judgment interest as provided by law at 10% per annum, in an amount according to proof.

27 70. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants, through their
28 conduct described herein, have committed an “intentional theft of wages in an amount greater than

1 nine hundred fifty dollars (\$950) from any one employee, or two thousand three hundred fifty dollars
2 (\$2,350) in the aggregate from two or more employees...in any consecutive 12-month period” within
3 the meaning of California Penal Code section 487m. Specifically, Defendants have intentionally
4 deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of wages, as defined in Labor Code section 200, gratuities, as
5 defined in Labor Code section 350, benefits, or other compensation, by unlawful means, with the
6 knowledge that the wages, gratuities, benefits, or other compensation is due to Plaintiff and Class
7 Members under the law. Plaintiff and the Class Members he seeks to represent are thus entitled to
8 recover from Defendants treble damages and costs, including reasonable attorneys’ fees, pursuant to
9 California Penal Code section 496(c).

10 71. Also, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5, Plaintiff will seek attorneys’
11 fees and costs from Defendants in an amount subject to proof and approved by the Court.

12 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**
13 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
14 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

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

17 73. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Section 226.7
18 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

19 74. The IWC Wage Orders require employers to authorize and permit all employees to take
20 10-minute duty-free rest periods for each four (4) hours worked, or major fraction thereof.

21 75. If an employer fails to provide an employee with a rest period in accordance with
22 California law, Labor Code Section 226.7(c) and the IWC Wage Orders require that the employer pay
23 the employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each
24 workday that the rest period is noncompliant.

25 76. During the relevant time period, Defendants did not implement a compliant rest break
26 policy and/or practice. Consequently, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive a 10-minute rest
27 period for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof because rest breaks were interrupted,
28 missed, late, shortened, on-duty, and/or restricted to the worksite.

1 77. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members
2 rest period premiums for noncompliant rest periods pursuant to Labor Code Section 226.7(b) and the
3 applicable IWC Wage Order.

4 78. As a result of Defendants' failure to provide compliant rest periods and pay rest period
5 premiums to Plaintiff and Class Members in accordance with the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code
6 Sections 226.7 and 516, Plaintiff and Class Members suffered and continue to suffer a loss of wages
7 and compensation.

8 79. Because Plaintiff and Class Members were and/or are entitled to such rest periods or
9 "premium pay" in lieu thereof, they are entitled to such payment per shift in an amount according to
10 proof. To the extent such unpaid premiums are deemed unpaid wages, Plaintiff will also seek pre- and
11 post-judgment interest as provided by law at 10% per annum, in an amount according to proof.

12 80. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants, through their
13 conduct described herein, have committed an "intentional theft of wages in an amount greater than
14 nine hundred fifty dollars (\$950) from any one employee, or two thousand three hundred fifty dollars
15 (\$2,350) in the aggregate from two or more employees...in any consecutive 12-month period" within
16 the meaning of California Penal Code section 487m. Specifically, Defendants have intentionally
17 deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of wages, as defined in Labor Code section 200, gratuities, as
18 defined in Labor Code section 350, benefits, or other compensation, by unlawful means, with the
19 knowledge that the wages, gratuities, benefits, or other compensation is due to Plaintiff and Class
20 Members under the law. Plaintiff and the Class Members he seeks to represent are thus entitled to
21 recover from Defendants treble damages and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to
22 California Penal Code section 496(c).

23 81. Also, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5, Plaintiff will seek attorneys'
24 fees and costs from Defendants in an amount subject to proof and approved by the Court.

25 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

27 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

28 82. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though

1 fully set forth herein.

2 83. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Section 226.

3 84. Labor Code Section 226(a) requires that, semimonthly or at the time of each payment
4 of wages, employers must furnish each employee with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing
5 that accurately shows (1) gross wages earned, (2) total number of hours worked, (3) the number of any
6 piece-rate units earned and all applicable piece rates, (4) all deductions made from wages, (5) net
7 wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period, (7) the name and last four digits or employment
8 identification number of the employee, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the
9 employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect and the corresponding number of hours worked
10 at each hourly rate.

11 85. Labor Code Section 226(e)(1) authorizes an employee suffering injury as a result of a
12 knowing and intentional failure by an employer to provide an accurate itemized wage statement to
13 recover the greater of all actual damages or \$50 for the initial pay violation and \$100 for each violation
14 in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of \$4,000 per employee, in addition to
15 an award of costs and attorneys' fees.

16 86. During the relevant time period, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally failed
17 to comply with Labor Code Section 226(a) on wage statements that were provided to Plaintiff and
18 Class Members. The deficiencies include, among other things, Defendants' failure to correctly state
19 the gross and net wages earned, the total hours worked, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the
20 pay period, and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

21 87. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code Section 226(a), Plaintiff
22 and Class Members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights. Specifically,
23 Plaintiff and Class Members have been injured by Defendants' intentional violation of California
24 Labor Code Section 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their
25 protected interest in receiving, accurate itemized wage statements under California Labor Code
26 Section 226(a). Plaintiff has had to file this lawsuit in order to determine the extent of the
27 underpayment of wages, thereby causing Plaintiff to incur expenses and lost time. Plaintiff would not
28 have had to engage in these efforts and incur these costs had Defendants provided the accurate wages

1 earned and number of hours worked at each corresponding pay rate. This has also delayed Plaintiff's
2 ability to demand and recover the underpayment of wages from Defendants.

3 88. Defendants' violations of California Labor Code Section 226(a) prevented Plaintiff and
4 Class Members from knowing, understanding and disputing the wages paid to them, and resulted in
5 an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional
6 failure to comply with California Labor Code Section 226(a), Plaintiff and Class Members have
7 suffered an injury, and the exact amount of damages and/or penalties is all in an amount to be shown
8 according to proof at trial.

9 89. Plaintiff and Class Members are also entitled to injunctive relief under California Labor
10 Code Section 226(h), compelling Defendants to comply with California Labor Code Section 226, and
11 seek the recovery of attorneys' fees and costs incurred in obtaining this injunctive relief.

12 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**

14 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

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

17 91. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Sections 201,
18 202, and 203. Defendants failed to comply with these final paycheck requirements with respect to
19 Waiting Time Subclass Members.

20 92. Labor Code Section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the
21 wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.

22 93. Labor Code Section 202 requires that if "an employee not having a written contract for
23 a definite period" quits, the employee's wages shall become due and payable no later than 72 hours
24 thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in
25 which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

26 94. Labor Code Section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without
27 abatement or reduction, any wages of an employee who is discharged or quits, the wages of the
28 employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an

1 action therefor is commenced, but that the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days per
2 employee.

3 95. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to pay Waiting Time
4 Subclass Members all their earned wages upon termination including, but not limited to, minimum,
5 regular, overtime, double time, and prevailing wages, premium compensation, and/or reimbursements
6 either at the time of discharge or within 72 hours of leaving Defendants' employ.

7 96. As a result of Defendants' failure to timely pay all wages owed to Waiting Time
8 Subclass Members in accordance with Labor Code Sections 201, 202 and 203, Waiting Time Subclass
9 Members are entitled to recover Waiting time penalties, prejudgment interest, attorneys' fees, and
10 costs in amounts that will be established at trial.

11 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

13 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

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

16 98. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Sections 2800
17 and 2802. Defendants failed to comply with these indemnification and reimbursement requirements
18 with respect to Plaintiff and Class Members.

19 99. Labor Code Section 2800 requires employers to indemnify employees for losses caused
20 by the employer's want of ordinary care. To the extent Defendants claim that Plaintiff and Class
21 Members failed to request, demand, notify or otherwise seek reimbursement for their expenses and
22 losses, Defendants were obligated to nevertheless indemnify Plaintiff and Class Members due to their
23 own negligence.

24 100. Labor Code Section 2802(a) requires that employers indemnify and reimburse
25 employees for all business expenses, which are defined as all necessary expenditures or losses incurred
26 by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of the employee's duties or otherwise incurred
27 based on the employee's obedience to the employer's directions. Labor Code Section 2802(b)
28 authorizes employees to recover in a court action interest which shall accrue from the date on which

1 the employee incurred the necessary expenditure or loss. Labor Code Section 2802(c) authorizes
2 employees, who to enforce their right to reimbursements under Labor Code Section 2802, to also
3 recover attorneys' fees and costs.

4 101. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Class
5 Members for all necessary business expenses incurred for Defendants' benefit in violation of Labor
6 Code Sections 2800 and 2802, as set forth above.

7 102. As a result of Defendants' failure to indemnify and reimburse Plaintiff and Class
8 Members for all business and work-related costs, expenditures, losses and expenses in accordance
9 with Labor Code Sections 2800 and 2802, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover the full
10 unreimbursed balance of reimbursements, expenditures and losses, prejudgment interest, and statutory
11 penalties, along with attorneys' fees and costs in amounts that will be established at trial.

12 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **VIOLATION OF THE UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW**

14 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

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

17 104. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful
18 and harmful to Plaintiff and Class Members. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the
19 public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5.

20 105. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, violate California law and constitute unlawful
21 business acts or practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et*
22 *seq.*

23 106. A violation of Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.* may be
24 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law.

25 107. Defendants' policies and practices have violated state law in at least the following
26 respects:

- 27 (a) Failing to pay all minimum, regular, overtime, double time, and prevailing wages due
28 to Plaintiff and Class Members in violation of Labor Code Sections 204, 206, 510, 558,

1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1771, 1774, 1811, and 1815;

(b) Failing to provide meal periods without paying Plaintiff and Class Members premium wages for every day in which a meal period was not provided in violation of Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512;

(c) Failing to authorize or permit rest breaks without paying Plaintiff and Class Members premium wages for every day in which a rest break was not authorized or permitted in violation of Labor Code Section 226.7;

(d) Failing to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code Section 226;

(e) Failing to timely pay all earned wages to Waiting Time Subclass Members upon separation of employment in violation of Labor Code Sections 201, 202 and 203; and

(f) Failing to reimburse business expenses in violation of Labor Code Sections 2800 and 2802.

108. Defendants intentionally avoided paying Plaintiff and Class Members wages and monies, thereby creating for Defendants an artificially lower cost of doing business in order to undercut their competitors and establish and gain a greater foothold in the marketplace.

109. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Sections 17202, 17203, and 17208, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages unlawfully withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences four (4) years prior to the filing of this action; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

110. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to an injunction, restitution, and other equitable relief against such unlawful practices to return all funds over which Plaintiff and Class Members have an ownership interest and to prevent future damage pursuant to Business and Professions Code Sections 17200 *et seq.*

///

///

///

1 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

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

13 113. On December 17, 2025, Plaintiff gave written notice of the specified provisions alleged
14 to have been violated by Defendants including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations,
15 as required by Labor Code section 2699.3 and paid the filing fee. This written notice was provided via
16 certified mail to Defendants and to the LWDA by electronically filing the notice via the Department
17 of Industrial Relations' website. More than 65 days have passed since Plaintiff submitted his PAGA
18 notice to the LWDA without a response from the LWDA. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a
19 civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code Section 2699 pursuant to Section 2699.3 for the
20 violations of the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited
21 to, penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558(a), 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

22 114. The statute of limitations is tolled while a plaintiff exhausts his or her administrative
23 remedies with the LWDA prior to suit, which is required by Labor Code Section 2699.3(d).

24 115. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants' violation of California Labor Code
25 Section 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 1174.5, any person, including any entity,
26 employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by California
27 Labor Code Section 1174 is subject to a penalty under Section 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC
28 Order Section 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins

1 and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.
2 Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order Section 7(A)(5), every employer shall keep total
3 hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

4 116. Defendants' conduct violates numerous Labor Code sections, including, but not limited
5 to, the following:

6 117. Violation of Labor Code Sections 201-204, 206, 210, 256, 510, 558, 1194, 1197,
7 1197.1, 1198, 1771, 1774, 1811, and 1815 for failure to timely pay all earned wages (including
8 minimum, regular, overtime, double time, and prevailing wages) owed to Plaintiff and other aggrieved
9 employees during employment and upon separation of employment as herein alleged;

10 118. Violation of Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512 for failure to provide meal periods to
11 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees and failure to pay premium wages for missed meal periods as
12 herein alleged;

13 119. Violation of Labor Code Section 226.7 for failure to permit rest breaks to Plaintiff and
14 other aggrieved employees and failure to pay premium wages for missed rest periods as herein alleged;

15 120. Violation of Labor Code Sections 226 and 226.3 for failure to provide accurate
16 itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as herein alleged;

17 121. Violation of Labor Code Sections 1174 and 1174.5 for failure to maintain accurate
18 records regarding the employment of Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as herein alleged; and

19 122. Violation of Labor Code Sections 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse business
20 expenses to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as herein alleged.

21 123. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699(c)(1), Plaintiff is an "aggrieved employee"
22 because he was employed by the alleged violators and personally suffered each of the alleged
23 violations committed against him, and therefore is properly suited to represent the interests of all other
24 aggrieved employees.

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

28 125. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2699(a), 2699.3 and 2699.5, Plaintiff is entitled to

1 recover civil penalties, injunctive relief, in addition to other remedies, for violations of the Labor Code
2 sections cited above.

3 126. For bringing this action, Plaintiff is entitled to attorney's fees and costs incurred herein
4 pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699(g)(1).

5 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

6 Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated and other Class Members,
7 other aggrieved employees, and the State of California, prays for relief and judgment against
8 Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

- 9 1. For certification of this action as a class action, including certifying the Class and
10 Subclass alleged by Plaintiff;
- 11 2. For appointment of Plaintiff Mauricio Perez as the class representative;
- 12 3. For appointment of Aris LLP as class counsel for all purposes;
- 13 4. For compensatory damages in an amount according to proof with interest thereon;
- 14 5. For economic and/or special damages in an amount according to proof with interest
15 thereon;
- 16 6. For damages, monetary relief, wages, premiums, benefits and penalties, including
17 interest thereon;
- 18 7. For Waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor Code Section 203;
- 19 8. For the amounts provided for in Labor Code Section 226.7;
- 20 9. For liquidated damages pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194.2;
- 21 10. For statutory penalties to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to the
22 Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;
- 23 11. For restitution to Plaintiff and Class Members of all money and property unlawfully
24 acquired by Defendants through unfair or unlawful business practices pursuant to
25 Business and Professions Code Sections 17200 *et seq.*;
- 26 12. For an order requiring Defendants to restore and disgorge all funds to each employee
27 acquired by means of any act or practice declared by this Court to be unlawful, unfair
28 or fraudulent and, therefore, constituting unfair competition under Business and


Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*;

13. For permanent injunctive relief described in the UCL and PAGA causes of action;
14. For prejudgment interest on all sums recovered pursuant to Labor Code Section 218.6 and Civil Code Sections 3287 and 3289, and applicable law;
15. For post judgment interest on all amounts awarded to Plaintiff and Class Members as provided by law;
16. For recovery of attorneys' fees and costs provided by Labor Code Sections 218.6, 226, 1194, 2802, and Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5;
17. For a declaratory judgment that the practices complained of herein are unlawful under California law;
18. Such other equitable relief as the Court may deem proper;
19. For treble damages;
20. For PAGA penalties; and
21. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: February 25, 2026

ARIS LLP

By: _____



Daniel J. Hyun

Shelly Song

Shaheen A. Etemadi

Attorneys for Plaintiff Mauricio Perez

///

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial with respect to all issues triable by jury.

Dated: February 25, 2026

ARIS LLP

By: _____

Daniel J. Hyun

Shelly Song

Shaheen A. Etemadi

Attorneys for Plaintiff Mauricio Perez