

LAW OFFICE OF SCOTT ERNEST WHEELER
Scott Ernest Wheeler (SBN 187998)
Justin A. Wheeler (SBN 342226)
250 West First Street, Suite 216
Claremont, California 91711
Telephone: (909) 621-4988
Facsimile: (909) 621-4622
Email: sew@scottwheelerlawoffice.com
jaw@scottwheelerlawoffice.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved
Employees*

Assigned for All Purposes
Judge Willian Claster
Dept. CX104

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE – CIVIL COMPLEX CENTER**

JUAN MEJIA, individually, and on behalf of
all other aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

v.

LAZY DOG RESTAURANTS, LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **30-2023-01342332-CU-OE-CXC**

**COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF THE
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT
OF 2004**

[California Labor Code § 2698 et seq.]

1 Plaintiff Juan Mejia (“Plaintiff”) brings this representative action, individually and on behalf of
2 all other aggrieved employees, to recover civil penalties relating to systematic violations of California
3 wage and hour laws by Lazy Dog Restaurants, LLC (“Lazy Dog” or “Defendant”). Plaintiff makes the
4 following allegations on information and belief, except as to allegations pertaining to Plaintiff
5 individually, which are based on his personal knowledge.

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. Defendant does business as Lazy Dog Restaurants, LLC, and owns and operates twenty-
8 six (26) or more fast casual dining restaurants throughout the state of California.

9 2. In an effort to conserve labor costs, and thereby maximize profits, Defendant has
10 implemented policies and practices that have resulted in systematic violations of California’s wage and
11 hour laws.

12 3. For example, Defendant has implemented unlawful policies with respect to meal and
13 rest breaks. Defendant requires its non-exempt employees, who are informed that the needs of the
14 restaurant and its patrons take top priority, to work through meal and rest breaks, to take untimely meal
15 periods and to remain on call during such breaks. As a result, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees
16 have been denied the ability to take meal and rest breaks that they were and are legally entitled to take.

17 4. Moreover, Defendant has uniformly failed to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved
18 employees proper overtime wages and minimum wages due to the fact that it has willfully turned a
19 blind eye to off-the-clock work that Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees perform as a direct
20 consequence of Defendant’s understaffing and imposition of an unreasonable workload.

21 5. Defendant also failed to pay timely wages to current and former employees and has
22 failed to maintain required employee records and provide accurate, itemized wage statements.

23 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

24 6. The Superior Court of the State of California has jurisdiction in this matter because
25 Defendant is licensed to do business under the laws of the State of California and does business in the
26 State of California. No federal question is at issue because Plaintiff’s claims are based solely on
27 California law.

28 7. Venue is proper in this judicial district and the County of Orange because Defendant

1 maintains one or more restaurants in the County of Orange, maintains its corporate headquarters in the
2 County of Orange, and aggrieved employees worked for Defendant at one or more of its restaurants
3 located in Costa Mesa, California, a city located in the County of Orange where the California Labor
4 Code violations occurred.

5 **THE PARTIES**

6 8. During the statute of limitations period, Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as a Food
7 Preparer at its location in Cupertino, California.

8 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant is, and at all times
9 relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware.

10 10. The true names and capacities of DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff
11 at this time, and Plaintiff therefore sues such defendants under fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed
12 and believes, and thereon alleges, that each defendant designated as a DOE is in some manner highly
13 responsible for the occurrences alleged herein, and that Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees'
14 injuries and damages, as alleged herein, were proximately caused by the conduct of such DOE
15 defendants. Plaintiff will seek leave of the Court to amend this Complaint to allege the true names and
16 capacities of such DOE defendants when ascertained.

17 **PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

18 11. On June 9, 2023, Plaintiff gave written notice by certified mail pursuant to California
19 Labor Code § 2699.3, to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and
20 Defendant, of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Order alleged to
21 have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. Plaintiff has not
22 received any response from the LWDA. As Plaintiff has waited more than sixty-five (65) days from
23 the June 9, 2023 postmark date of his written notice before filing this action, Plaintiff has complied
24 with all of the requirements set forth in California Labor Code § 2699.3 to commence a representative
25 action under the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA").

26 12. Pursuant to the PAGA, California Labor Code §§ 2698-2699.5, Plaintiff brings this
27 action on behalf of the State of California, and all other aggrieved employees (e.g., current and former
28 non-exempt employees of Defendants who are California citizens and performed work for Defendants

1 in the State of California at any time within the period beginning one (1) year prior to the June 9, 2023
2 notice Plaintiff provided to the LWDA and Defendants, and ending at the time this action proceeds to
3 final judgment (“statute of limitations period”).

4 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

5 **Failure to Provide Required Meal Periods**

6 **[Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and § 11 of the applicable IWC Order]**

7 13. During the statute of limitations period, as part of Defendant’s illegal policies and
8 practices to minimize labor costs and maximize corporate profits, Defendant has required, permitted or
9 otherwise suffered Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to perform work during their meal periods, to
10 completely skip their meal periods, to take late and short meal periods, and Defendant has otherwise
11 failed to provide the required meal periods to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees as required under
12 California Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and § 11 of the applicable IWC Order.

13 14. Defendant has implemented several practices that have caused Plaintiff and aggrieved
14 employees to systematically miss and otherwise take non-compliant meal periods. Defendant
15 systematically understaffs its job sites such that aggrieved employees are given so much work to
16 complete that they regularly miss or otherwise take non-compliant meal periods. As a direct
17 consequence of this understaffing, Plaintiff and aggrieved employees have so much work to complete
18 within their scheduled shifts that they are forced to skip their meal periods altogether, to take them after
19 working longer than five (5) hours, to perform work during their meal periods, or return to work after
20 taking less than a thirty (30) minute meal period. Moreover, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees
21 need to secure permission before taking a meal period, which is often denied by supervisors.

22 15. There are also frequent occasions when Plaintiff and aggrieved employees need to
23 perform other duties immediately before the time during which they are legally entitled to take a meal
24 period. Pursuant to Defendant’s policies, Plaintiff and aggrieved employees cannot simply drop their
25 job duties and leave a customer, refuse an order or stop cooking in order to take a meal period.
26 Consequently, Plaintiff and aggrieved employees regularly miss meal periods, take late meal periods,
27 return early from meal periods, and even clock out for meal periods but continue working.

28 16. Plaintiff and aggrieved employees need to secure permission before taking a meal

1 period. Plaintiff and aggrieved employees often cannot simply stop taking an order from a customer or
2 stop cooking to take their meal period, and their inability to secure coverage frequently causes them to
3 miss and otherwise take non-compliant meal periods.

4 17. Despite the foregoing, Defendant has implemented a policy and practice of actively
5 discouraging the issuance of meal period premium payments, and in the process, Defendant has violated
6 California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and § 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, by failing to compensate
7 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees who were not authorized and permitted to take a complete, timely,
8 uninterrupted meal period, one additional hour of compensation at the proper regular rate of pay for
9 each workday that such a meal period was not authorized or permitted.

10 18. Defendant also implemented an unlawful meal period policy by compensating Plaintiff
11 and aggrieved employees for interrupted meal periods only for their actual work time, as opposed to
12 paying them the legally required premium payments for non-compliant meal periods.

13 **Failure to Provide Required Rest Breaks**

14 **[Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and § 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order]**

15 19. During the statute of limitations period, as part of Defendant's illegal policies and
16 practices to minimize labor costs and maximize corporate profits, Defendant has failed to authorize and
17 permit Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees to take rest breaks as required under California Labor
18 Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and § 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order.

19 20. The same or similar policies and practices that deprive Plaintiff and other aggrieved
20 employees from taking their meal periods, as alleged herein, similarly deprive them of their ability to
21 take their first and second and third rest breaks. As alleged herein, Defendant understaffs its restaurant,
22 which creates so much work for Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees that they are frequently unable
23 to take rest breaks. Moreover, Plaintiff and aggrieved employees need to first secure permission before
24 taking a rest break. Plaintiff and aggrieved employees often cannot simply stop assisting a customer or
25 stop preparing food to take a rest break, and their inability to secure coverage causes them to regularly
26 miss and otherwise take non-compliant rest breaks.

27 21. Defendant also does not provide adequate training regarding its legal obligations with
28 respect to the provision of rest breaks, does not implement a schedule regarding rest breaks for non-

1 exempt employees, and often interrupts staff who try to take rest periods. In short, Defendant essentially
2 has a non-existent rest break policy, as there is no guidance or specification as to when Plaintiff and
3 other aggrieved employees are authorized and permitted to take rest breaks during their shifts.

4 22. Defendant also violated California Labor Code § 226.7, and § 12 of the applicable IWC
5 Order, by failing to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees who were not provided with a rest
6 break, in accordance with the applicable wage order, one additional hour of compensation at the proper
7 regular rate of pay for each workday that a rest break was not provided.

8 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

9 **[Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and § 3 of the applicable IWC Order]**

10 23. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and § 3 of the applicable IWC Order,
11 Defendant is required to compensate Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for all overtime, which
12 is calculated at one and one-half (1 ½) times the regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of
13 eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week, and for the first eight (8) hours on the seventh
14 consecutive workday, with double time for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in any
15 workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work
16 in any workweek.

17 24. During the statute of limitations period, Defendant failed to compensate Plaintiff and
18 other aggrieved employees for all overtime hours worked as required under the foregoing provisions
19 of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Order by, among other methods: failing to pay overtime
20 at one and one-half (1 ½) or double the regular rate of pay as provided by California Labor Code §§
21 510, 1194 and § 3 of the applicable IWC Order, requiring, permitting or suffering Plaintiff and other
22 aggrieved employees to work off-the-clock, and to work through meal and rest breaks, but not
23 compensating them for this time, unlawful rounding of time worked by Plaintiff and the other aggrieved
24 employees in favor of Defendant, improperly calculating the regular rate of pay based on bonuses,
25 commissions, and other remuneration, and other methods to be discovered.

26 25. In a short-sighted attempt to maximize profits, Defendant has understaffed its restaurant
27 located in Cupertino, California. Not only has this practice resulted in widespread missed meal and rest
28 breaks, but it has also caused Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees to perform work while off-the-

1 clock. Defendant has actual or constructive knowledge of this off-the-clock work and subtly condones
2 it. Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees routinely arrive to work early to check so that they are
3 prepared and ready to begin performing their duties promptly at the start of their shifts, as they must be
4 pursuant to the requirements of Defendant. Defendant knows that Plaintiff and other aggrieved
5 employees perform this work off-the-clock.

6 26. Defendant has knowingly and willfully refused to perform its obligations to compensate
7 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for all wages earned and all hours worked in violation of
8 California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194 and 1198, and § 3 of the applicable IWC Order.

9 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

10 **[Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and § 4 of the applicable IWC Wage Order]**

11 27. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197, and § 4 of the applicable IWC Wage Order,
12 payment to an employee of less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in a payroll
13 period is unlawful.

14 28. During the statute of limitations period, the hourly rates for Plaintiff and other aggrieved
15 employees were precisely at California minimum wage. Based on this common practice, Defendant
16 failed to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees minimum wages for all hours worked by
17 requiring, permitting or suffering Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees to work off the clock, such
18 as requiring them to work through meal and rest breaks but not compensating them for this time,
19 unlawful rounding of time worked by Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees in favor of
20 Defendant, and failing to include this time in all hours worked, and other methods to be discovered.

21 29. Defendant's conduct described herein violates Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197, and § 4
22 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, Plaintiff
23 and other aggrieved employees have been damaged in an amount according to proof at trial. Therefore,
24 pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 200, 203, 226, 1194, 1197.1, and any other applicable law,
25 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of wages owed to
26 them by Defendant, plus interest, penalties, attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs of suit.

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

2 **[Labor Code § 204]**

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

11 31. During the statute of limitations period, Defendant has knowingly and willfully failed
12 to timely pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees all the wages for labor performed by the next
13 regular payroll period as required by California Labor Code § 204, including but not limited to,
14 compensation for missed meal and rest breaks, proper overtime wages due to an unlawful calculation
15 of the regular rate of pay, and for work performed off-the-clock.

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

17 **[Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203]**

18 32. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203, Defendant is required to pay
19 all earned and unpaid wages to an employee who is discharged. California Labor Code § 201 mandates
20 that if an employer discharges an employee, the employee's wages accrued and unpaid at the time of
21 discharge are due and payable immediately.

22 33. Furthermore, pursuant to California Labor Code § 202, Defendant is required to pay all
23 accrued wages due to an employee no later than 72 hours after the employee quits his or her
24 employment, unless the employee provided 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 34. California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, in
27 accordance with Labor Code §§ 201 and 202, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who
28 quits, the employer is liable for waiting time penalties in the form of continued compensation to the

1 employee at the same rate for up to 30 workdays.

2 35. During the statute of limitations period, Defendant has willfully failed to pay accrued
3 wages and other compensation to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees in accordance with California
4 Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. On information and belief, Defendant does not have sufficient policies to
5 provide Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees with their final paychecks within the timeframes
6 required under California law. Defendant continues to fail to properly compensate other aggrieved
7 employees for all hours worked when due, overtime wages, and compensation for non-compliant meal
8 and rest breaks, Defendant also willfully failed and continues to fail to pay accrued wages and other
9 compensation to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees in accordance with California Labor Code §§
10 201 and 202.

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

12 **[Labor Code § 226(a) and § 7 of the applicable IWC Order]**

13 36. During the statute of limitations period, Defendant routinely failed to provide Plaintiff
14 and other aggrieved employees with timely and accurate itemized wage statements. Defendant's pay
15 stubs have violated California Labor Code § 226. Next, Defendant was and is not providing Plaintiff
16 and other aggrieved employees with proper meal periods and rest breaks but intentionally fails to
17 include in their wage statements one (1) additional hour of compensation at their regular rates of pay
18 for each non-compliant meal period or rest break. Moreover, Defendant has failed to pay proper
19 overtime wages to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees and their wage statements therefore fail to
20 reflect the correct hourly rates worked by Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees.

21 37. In order to conceal its wage theft, Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to
22 provide Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees with timely and accurate itemized wage statements in
23 accordance with Labor Code § 226(a) and § 7 of the applicable IWC Order.

24 38. Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees suffered injury as a result of the failure of
25 Defendant to provide timely and accurate itemized wage statements because it prevented them from
26 discovering the scope and extent of Defendant's violations of California wage and hour laws, prevented
27 them from being able to accurately determine the gross wages earned, the total hours worked, all
28 deductions made, the net wages earned, all applicable hourly rates in effect during each pay period and

1 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate and the balance and available amount
2 of sick leave.

3 **Failure to Maintain Required Records**

4 **[Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 1174(d) and § 7 of the applicable IWC Order]**

5 39. During the statute of limitations period, as part of Defendant's illegal payroll policies
6 and practices to deprive Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees of all wages earned and due,
7 Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to maintain records as required under California Labor
8 Code §§ 226(a) and 1174(d) and § 7 of the applicable IWC Order, including but not limited to the
9 following records: total daily hours worked by each employee; including but not limited to, applicable
10 rates of pay relating to non-discretionary bonus payments, overtime and double-time; all deductions;
11 meal and/or rest periods; time records showing when each employee begins and ends each work period;
12 and accurate itemized statements that reflect all compensation, rates of pay for all compensation paid
13 and remuneration owed and due to them. Defendant had knowledge that it was not providing its non-
14 exempt employees with proper meal and rest periods, but knowingly failed to include in the wage
15 statements one (1) extra hour of compensation for each missed meal and rest period. Defendant also
16 illegally and inaccurately recorded the time in which Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees worked.
17 Defendant has also failed to maintain accurate, itemized wage statements, as alleged above.

18 **Failure to Pay COVID-19 Supplemental Sick Leave**

19 **[Labor Code §§ 246, 248.1, 248.2, 248.6]**

20 40. During the Statute of Limitations Period, Plaintiff is informed and believes from January
21 1, 2021 through December 31, 2022, Defendant employed 26 or more aggrieved employees.

22 41. Defendant failed to provide 80 hours of COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick leave and
23 compensate aggrieved employees at their regular rate of pay for supplemental sick leave, i.e., their
24 highest regular rate of pay, taking into consideration non-discretionary bonuses, etc., in violation of
25 California Labor Code § 248.1(b)(3)(A) and §248.6. Defendant also failed to provide COVID-19
26 Supplemental Sick Leave to aggrieved employees in addition to regular sick leave, in violation of
27 California Labor Code § 248.1(b)(2)(D). Defendant also failed to accurately reflect any offset and/or
28 the current amount of COVID-19 Supplemental Sick Leave available to aggrieved employees on their

1 wage statements, in violation of California Labor Code §§ 248.1(b)(2)(D), 248.2, 248.6 and for the
2 reasons provided herein.

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

4 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 2802]**

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

8 43. During the Statute of Limitations Period, Defendant failed to reimburse aggrieved
9 employees for the usage of their personal cellular phones in addition to personal protective equipment
10 during the COVID-19 pandemic, including face masks and disposable gloves and other supplies.
11 Defendant did not reimburse Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for the costs of the expenditures
12 relating to their cellular phones, face masks and other supplies.

13 **Failure to Provide Suitable Seating**

14 **[IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, §14]**

15 44. IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 14 provides:

16 “Where practicable and consistent with applicable industry-wide standards,
17 all working employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature
of the work reasonably permits the use of seats.

18 45. Defendant failed to provide suitable seating by not providing any seats or stools for
19 those aggrieved employees working as hostesses. The nature of the work reasonably permits the use of
20 seats for aggrieved employees who work as hostesses regarding the performance of their duties and
21 responsibilities. To the extent that the use of seats could interfere with their work duties, at all times
22 herein it is and has been reasonable for Defendant to place seats in reasonable proximity to work areas
23 to be used by the aggrieved employees when doing so would not interfere with their job duties and
24 responsibilities.
25
26
27
28

1 **Failure to Maintain Required Records**

2 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 2810.5]**

3 46. During the statute of limitations period, as part of Defendant's illegal payroll policies
4 and practices to deprive Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees of all wages earned and due,
5 Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to maintain records as required under California Labor
6 Code §2801.5, which requires a California employer to provide written notice at the time of hiring of
7 certain employment related information, including but not limited to, the name of the employer,
8 including any "doing business as" names used by the employer, and the physical address of the
9 employer's main office or principal place of business, and a mailing address, if different.

10 47. Defendant failed to comply with California Labor Code § 2810.5 by not listing the
11 correct business entity for whom work will be performed by Plaintiff and the other aggrieved
12 employees.

13 **Failure to Provide Employment Records**

14 **[Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 7]**

15 48. California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001, § 7
16 require California employers to provide to copies of their personnel files and certain other
17 employment records upon their request.

18 49. On March 9, 2023, and on April 13, 2023, Plaintiff, through his counsel of record,
19 requested copies of these records from Defendant. Authorization forms, expressly permitting the
20 disclosure of these records to counsel, signed by Plaintiff, were submitted to Defendant along with
21 the request. No response was received from Defendant regarding the request for the payroll records
22 and personnel file.

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

25 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 *et seq.*]**

26 **(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees Against Defendant)**

27 50. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the
28 allegations in paragraphs 1 through 49 above.

1 51. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” within the meaning of California Labor Code §
2 2699(c), and a proper representative to bring a civil action on behalf of himself and other aggrieved
3 employees pursuant to the procedures specified in California Labor Code § 2699.3, because Plaintiff
4 was employed by Defendant and one or more of the alleged California Labor Code violations was
5 committed against Plaintiff during the statute of limitations period.

6 52. Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties through a representative action permitted by
7 PAGA and the California Supreme Court in *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969. Thus, class
8 certification is not required.

9 53. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2698-2699.5, Plaintiff seeks to recover civil
10 penalties from Defendant in a representative action for the violations set forth above, including but not
11 limited to, violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558,
12 1174, 1194 and for the violations of the applicable IWC Wage Order alleged above.

13 54. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(a), Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties
14 against Defendant for violations of California Labor Code provisions for which a civil penalty is
15 specifically provided, including but not limited to, the following:

- 16 a. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 210, for violations of California Labor
17 Code § 204, Defendant is subject to a civil penalty in the amount of one
18 hundred dollars (\$100) for the initial violation for each failure to pay each
19 employee, and two hundred dollars (\$200) per employee for violations in
20 subsequent pay periods.
- 21 b. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.3, for violations of California Labor
22 Code § 226(a), Defendant is subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two
23 hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) per aggrieved employee for the initial pay
24 period where a violation occurs and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per
25 aggrieved employee for violations in subsequent pay periods.
- 26 c. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, for violations of California Labor
27 Code § 1174(d), Defendant is subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars
28 (\$500).

1 55. California Labor Code § 2699(f) provides that for all California Labor Code violations
2 for which a civil penalty is not specifically provided, the following civil penalties are established: one
3 hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two
4 hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

5 56. Plaintiff seeks to recover such civil penalties under California Labor Code § 2699(f) for
6 Defendant's violations of California Labor Code provisions for which a civil penalty is not specifically
7 provided, including but not limited to, California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226.7, and 1197,
8 and for the violations of the applicable IWC Wage Order alleged above.

9 57. All civil penalties sought and recovered under this action will be allocated as follows:
10 seventy-five (75) percent to the State of California and twenty-five (25) percent to Plaintiff and
11 aggrieved employees.

12 58. Plaintiff additionally seeks reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California
13 Labor Code § 2699(g)(1) and California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

14 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

15 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees and the
16 State of California, prays for relief against Defendant, as follows:

- 17 1. For civil penalties according to proof;
18 2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g),
19 California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and/or any other applicable provisions providing for
20 attorneys' fees and costs; and
21 3. For such further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

22 DATED: August 15, 2023

THE LAW OFFICE OF SCOTT ERNEST WHEELER

23
24 By: 

SCOTT ERNEST WHEELER
JUSTIN A. WHEELER

25
26 *Attorneys for Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved*
27 *Employees*
28