

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)
Margaux K. Gundzik, Esq. (SBN 340116)
Lusine Hayrapetyan, Esq. (SBN 367146)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
jklein@lelawfirm.com
mgundzik@lelawfirm.com
lhayrapetyan@lelawfirm.com

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
3/09/2026 5:05 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By E. Galicia, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff MICHAEL FRANCIS,
on behalf of himself and current and former aggrieved employees

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

MICHAEL FRANCIS, on behalf of himself and
current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

DEBOER SECURITY GLOBAL INC; and
DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **26STCV07554**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF MICHAEL FRANCIS'
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff MICHAEL FRANCIS ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains
against Defendants DEBOER SECURITY GLOBAL INC; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive
(collectively "Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*
("PAGA") representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California, himself
and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-exempt

1 employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated with
2 Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all hours
3 worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure to
4 authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant meal periods or pay meal period premium
5 wages; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or pay rest
6 period premium wages; indemnification for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by
7 employees in direct consequence of discharging their duties; statutory penalties for failure to timely
8 pay earned wages during employment; statutory penalties for failure to provide accurate wage
9 statements; statutory waiting time penalties in the form of continuation wages for failure to timely
10 pay employees all wages due upon separation of employment. Plaintiff experienced these violations
11 personally, as well as is informed and believes other aggrieved employees did as well. Plaintiff
12 seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency,
13 civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs
14 brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

15 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

16 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
17 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
18 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
19 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of thirty-five thousand dollars
20 (\$35,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
21 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
22 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
23 California, including but not limited to Los Angeles County.

24 **III. PARTIES**

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

1 for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
2 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently
3 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by
4 Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Los Angeles County from in or around
5 May 29, 2025, until on or about September 22, 2025.

6 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant DEBOER
7 SECURITY GLOBAL INC is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing
8 business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant
9 hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant DEBOER SECURITY GLOBAL INC in the
10 establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies.
11 Defendant DEBOER SECURITY GLOBAL INC operates in Los Angeles County and employed
12 aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County.

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

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

24 5. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100. Plaintiff
25 sues said defendants by said fictitious names, and will amend this complaint when the true names
26 and capacities are ascertained or when such facts pertaining to liability are ascertained, or as
27 permitted by law or by the Court. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously
28 named defendants is in some manner responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this

1 complaint.

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

5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**
7 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

8 **(Against all Defendants by Plaintiff on behalf of Themselves, the State of California, and**
9 **Other Current and Former Aggrieved Employees)**

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

11 8. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges
12 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197,
13 2802, and the applicable Wage Orders.

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

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

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

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

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

3 (a) Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
4 based hourly non-exempt employees' their actual hours worked during their shifts and instead paid
5 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees by
6 scheduled hours despite that they routinely worked beyond their scheduled hours.

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

13 14. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
14 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
15 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
16 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

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

1 in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay
2 for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a
workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an
employee.

3 Labor Code section 510.

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

7 (a) Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
8 based hourly non-exempt employees' their actual hours worked during their shifts and instead paid
9 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees by
10 scheduled hours despite that they routinely worked beyond their scheduled hours.

11 18. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
12 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
13 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
14 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

15 19. The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each
16 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
17 employees were under the control of Defendants but were not compensated. To the extent that the
18 foregoing uncompensated time occurred when Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
19 California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday,
20 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendants failed
21 to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code
22 sections 510, 1194 and 1198, and the applicable Wage Order.

23 20. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
24 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant meal periods and/or failure to**
25 **pay period premium wages:** Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
26 hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked shifts of more than five (5) hours in length and
27 shifts of more than ten (10) hours in length.

28 21. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an

uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 4 at §11; *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. A paid "on duty" meal period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

22. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 4 at §11.

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

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

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

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

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

3 26. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
4 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
5 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
6 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

11 28. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
12 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor Code
13 section 226.7; Wage Order 4 at §12. Under California law, "[e]mployees are entitled to 10 minutes'
14 rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six
15 hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on." *Brinker*
16 *Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code section 226.7;
17 Wage Order 4 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each work period.
18 Wage Order 4 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement "'obligates employers to permit –
19 and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.'" *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*
20 (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all
21 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

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

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

1 limited to:

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

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

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

14 33. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
15 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
16 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
17 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

23 35. Defendants have violated Labor Code Section 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiff
24 and other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees' necessary
25 expenditures they incurred in the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendants employed
26 policies, practices, and/or procedures included, but not limited to:

27 (a) requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
28 non-exempt employees to use or purchase their own tools and/or resources in order to work for

1 Defendants, including but not limited to personal cell phone usage for work-related purposes -
2 without reimbursing Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
3 exempt employees for such use.

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

8 37. Therefore, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for their
9 employment related expenses, including but not limited to costs related to use of their personal cell
10 phones and costs associated with their uniforms pursuant to Labor Code section 2802.

11 38. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
12 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
13 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
14 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

24 40. As a derivative of Plaintiff's claims above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to
25 timely pay Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
26 employees' earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages
27 and/or rest period premium wages), in violation of Labor Code section 204. Defendants'
28 aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in their failure to pay Plaintiff's and

1 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' their earned
2 wages within the applicable time frames outlined in Labor Code section 204.

3 41. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
4 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
5 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

6 42. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
7 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
8 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
9 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by
10 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful
11 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,
12 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor
13 Code section 1198, the Defendant secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while
14 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

15 43. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
16 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
17 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

18 44. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section
19 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an employee
20 his or her wages, the employer must "furnish each of his or her employees ... an itemized statement
21 in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any
22 employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
23 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare
24 Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
25 is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all deductions made on written orders
26 of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive
27 dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her
28 social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all

1 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
2 worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

3 45. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff
4 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
5 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period
6 premium wages) rendered Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based
7 hourly non-exempt employees’ wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section
8 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

9 46. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

10 47. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
11 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
12 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

22 50. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

23 51. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
24 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
25 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

1 section 2699.3.

2 53. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
3 section 2699.3. On December 3, 2025, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and
4 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of
5 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
6 violations alleged.

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

12 55. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
13 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7,
14 510, 512, and 1194. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, preceding
15 Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the following
16 amounts:

17 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, and 2802;
18 one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and
19 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent
20 violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

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

25 c. For violations of Labor Code section 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50) for each
26 employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, one
27 hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts
28 established by Labor Code section 558].

1 d. For violations of Labor Code section 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for
2 each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, or any
3 willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee,
4 plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code
5 section 210].

6 e. For violations of Labor Code section 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for
7 each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, or any
8 willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee,
9 plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code
10 section 225.5].

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

13 **(a) Unlawful Non-Compete Agreement in Violation of Labor Code section**
14 **432.5:** Employer required Plaintiff and other aggrieved California employees, as a condition of hire
15 and continued employment, to execute non-compete agreements that were overbroad, unlawful and
16 invalid (the "Restrictive Covenant Agreement"). These post-employment restrictive covenants
17 improperly restrained lawful competition and solicitation. Employees were required to execute the
18 agreement in order to begin and/or continue employment, and it was presented as a mandatory
19 condition of employment.

20 **(b)** Specifically, Employer required its employees to enter into employment
21 contracts and/or required as a condition of employment that employees "shall not," in any manner,
22 directly or indirectly, for themselves or on behalf of any other person, firm, or corporation, solicit,
23 divert, induce, attempt to induce, "take away," or provide services to any "clients" or "prospective
24 clients" of DeBoer Security. The agreement broadly defined such clients to include entities with
25 whom the company had services, business contract, or substantive discussions within the preceding
26 twelve (12) months and during the Restricted Period.

27 a. The agreement provides, among other things, that: (1) the employee must
28 reimburse DeBoer Security for "any loss of income" allegedly incurred as a result of the employee's

direct or indirect involvement in moving a company client to a new company; and (2) DeBoer Security is entitled to seek injunctive relief upon a former employee's decision to work for or associate with a competing business (without bond and without proof of actual damages) and the employee agrees not to oppose such relief; and (4) DeBoer Security may notify any future or prospective employer or third party of the existence of the agreement and seek injunctive relief for any breach.

b. Labor Code § 432.5 prohibits an employer (and its agents/managers) from requiring an employee or applicant to agree in writing to any term or condition that the employer knows is prohibited by law.

c. Here, Employer required employees to sign restraints that are prohibited under California's longstanding policy barring contractual restraints on engaging in a lawful profession, trade, or business (e.g., Business & Professions Code § 16600), and the agreement does not fit within narrow statutory exceptions (such as sale-of-business contexts). In addition, since January 1, 2024, California law expressly makes it unlawful to include a "noncompete clause" in an employment contract or require an employee to enter a "noncompete agreement" that does not satisfy an exception and separately prohibits employers from entering into or attempting to enforce provisions void under California's restraint-of-trade chapter. By maintaining a standard onboarding requirement that employees sign these restraints and by including coercive enforcement provisions, Employer violated Labor Code § 432.5 during the PAGA period.

d. Based on these violations, Employee will seek civil penalties pursuant to PAGA, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, under Labor Code section 432.5 and/or Labor Code section 2699(f)(2) on behalf of LWDA, against Employer if authorized to file a representative action on behalf of the State of California.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

1. That Defendants be found to have violated the provisions of the Labor Code and the

1 IWC Wages Orders as to the Plaintiff and aggrieved employees;

2 2. For any and all legally applicable penalties during the relevant statute of limitations
3 subject to any permissible tolling, including but not limited to those recoverable under the California
4 Labor Code, including but not limited to sections 210, 225.5, 226.3, 432.5, 558, 2699(f);

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

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

9 Dated: March 9, 2026

12 Respectfully submitted,
13 **LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP**

14 By: /s/ Lusine Hayrapetyan
15 Joseph Lavi, Esq.
16 Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
17 Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.
18 Margaux K. Gundzik, Esq.
19 Lusine Hayrapetyan, Esq.
20 Attorneys for Plaintiff
21 MICHAEL FRANCIS, on behalf of himself and
22 current and former aggrieved employees
23
24
25
26
27
28