

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Courtney M. Miller, Esq. (SBN 327850)
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
cmiller@lelawfirm.com
WHT1@lelawfirm.com

E-FILED
8/21/2023 11:04 AM
Clerk of Court
Superior Court of CA,
County of Santa Clara
23CV421221
Reviewed By: R. Walker

Attorneys for Plaintiff GABRIELLE E. CARRICK,
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees,

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA**

GABRIELLE E. CARRICK, on behalf of herself
and current and former aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PELOTON INTERACTIVE, INC.; and DOES 1
to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **23CV421221**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF GABRIELLE E.
CARRICK'S COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff GABRIELLE E. CARRICK ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and
complains against Defendants PELOTON INTERACTIVE, 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, herself
and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-
exempt employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated

1 with Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay all overtime
2 hours worked at the proper overtime rate of pay; failure to authorize or permit all legally required
3 and/or compliant meal periods or pay meal period premium wages; failure to authorize or permit
4 all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or pay rest period premium wages;
5 indemnification for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by employees in direct
6 consequence of discharging their duties; failure to timely pay earned wages during employment,
7 failure to produce requested employment records failure to provide complete and accurate wage
8 statements, and failure to timely pay all unpaid wages following separation of employment.
9 Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce
10 Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section
11 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

12 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
14 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
15 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
16 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars
17 (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
18 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
19 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
20 California, including but not limited to Santa Clara County at 180 El Camino Real, Space 16A,
21 Palo Alto, CA 94304.

22 3. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Judicial Council of California enacted
23 Emergency Rule 9 to the California Rules of Court, which provided that, notwithstanding any
24 other law, the statutes of limitations and repose for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are
25 tolled from April 6, 2020, until October 1, 2020.

26 **III. PARTIES**

27 4. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
28 Development Agency on behalf of herself and other current and former employees subject to

1 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
2 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will
3 work for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
4 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the
5 currently named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was
6 employed by Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Palo Alto from
7 approximately October 31, 2017, until on or about July 7, 2022.

8 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant PELOTON
9 INTERACTIVE, INC. is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing
10 business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant
11 hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant PELOTON INTERACTIVE, INC. in the
12 establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies.
13 Defendant PELOTON INTERACTIVE, INC. operates in Santa Clara County and employed
14 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Santa Clara County, including but not limited to, at 180 El
15 Camino Real, Space 16A, Palo Alto, CA 94304.

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

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

27 8. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100. Plaintiff
28 sues said defendants by said fictitious names, and will amend this complaint when the true names

1 and capacities are ascertained or when such facts pertaining to liability are ascertained, or as
2 permitted by law or by the Court. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously
3 named defendants is in some manner responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this
4 complaint.

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

8 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**
10 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

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

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

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

16 12. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California
17 Labor Code:

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

24 14. 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
26 (40) 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)
28 hours in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of
work in any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-
one-half (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve

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

Labor Code section 510.

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

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

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

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

19. 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; Wage Order 7 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.

20. 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 section 226.7; Wage Order 7 at §11.

21. 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; and

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

22. 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

1 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
2 employees did not receive legally required and compliant meal periods, in violation of Labor Code
3 section 226.7.

4 23. Finally, on occasions when Defendants paid Plaintiff and other current and former
5 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a “premium” wage for late, missed,
6 short, on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted meal periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1)
7 additional hour of pay at Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based
8 hourly non-exempt employees’ regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained
9 a policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as “commissions,”
10 for example, when calculating Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based
11 hourly non-exempt employees’ regular rate of pay for the purpose of calculating and paying meal
12 period premium wages.

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

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

21 26. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
22 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor
23 Code section 226.7; Wage Order 7 at §12. Under California law, “[e]mployees are entitled to 10
24 minutes’ rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more
25 than six hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so
26 on.” *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code
27 section 226.7; Wage Order 7 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of
28 each work period. Wage Order 7 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement “obligates

1 employers to permit – and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM*
2 *Security Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must
3 relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

4 27. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer
5 must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday
6 the employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7;
7 Wage Order 7 at § 12.

8 28. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit all legally required and
9 compliant rest periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
10 non-exempt employees due to Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not
11 limited to:

12 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiffs and other current and former aggrieved California-
13 based hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours
14 worked or major fraction thereof; and

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

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

24 30. Finally, on occasions when Defendants did pay Plaintiff and other current and
25 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a “premium” wage for late,
26 missed, short, on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted rest periods, Defendants failed to pay the
27 one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-
28 based hourly non-exempt employees’ regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Defendants

maintained a policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as “commissions,” for example, when calculating Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees’ regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying rest period premiums.

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

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

33. Defendants have violated Labor Code Section 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees’ necessary expenditures they incurred in the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendants employed a policy, practice, and procedure whereby Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees who work remotely were required to use or purchase their own tools and/or resources in order to work for Defendants, including but not limited to their internet, and/or cell phone (including both telephone use and cellular data use) for work-related purposes - without reimbursing Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees for such use.

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

35. Therefore, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for their

1 employment related expenses, including but not limited to costs related to use of their personal
2 cell phones and costs associated with their uniforms pursuant to Labor Code section 2802.

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

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

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

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

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

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

16 41. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, because Defendants failed to pay
17 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
18 all their earned wages (overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay, meal period premium
19 wages, meal period premium wages at the proper rate, rest period premium wages, and/or rest
20 period premium wages at the proper rate), Defendants failed to pay those employees timely after
21 each employee’s termination and/or resignation, in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and
22 203.

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

27 43. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor
28 Code section 2699.3. On June 16, 2023, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and

1 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of
2 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
3 violations alleged.

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

9 45. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
10 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510,
11 512, 1194, 2802, During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, preceding
12 Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the following
13 amounts:

14 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226.7, 512, and
15 2802; one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial
16 violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each
17 subsequent violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

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

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

26 d. For violations of Labor Code section 1194, one hundred dollars (\$100) for
27 each underpaid employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent
28 violation, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period

1 [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 1197.1].

2 46. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g), Plaintiff is entitled to an award of
3 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with her claims for civil penalties.

4 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 **WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HERSELF AND ON OTHER**
6 **AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:**

7 **ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:**

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

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

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

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

17
18 Dated: August 21, 2023

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP



19
20 By:

Joseph Lavi, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Courtney M. Miller, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
GABRIELLE E. CARRICK, on behalf of
herself and current and former aggrieved
employees