

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
N. Nick Ebrahimian, Esq. (SBN 219270)
Email: nebrahimian@lelawfirm.com
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
Alan A. Wilcox, Esq. (SBN 287476)
awilcox@lelawfirm.com
Melanie S. Rodriguez, Esq. (SBN 330280)
mrodriguez@lelawfirm.com
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
8/15/2023 4:23 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By Y. Ayala, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff DAVID CARAVANTES,
on behalf of himself and current and former aggrieved employees,

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES-CENTRAL DISTRICT**

DAVID CARAVANTES, on behalf of himself
and current and former aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GIL & ROY PROPS, LLC; GIL & ROY
STUDIOS, LLC; MODERNICA, INC.; and
DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **23STCV19491**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF DAVID CARAVANTES'
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff DAVID CARAVANTES ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and
complains against Defendants GIL & ROY PROPS, LLC; GIL & ROY STUDIOS, LLC;
MODERNICA, 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

1 and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-
2 exempt employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated
3 with Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all
4 hours worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure
5 to authorize or permit all legally required and/or legally compliant meal periods and/or pay meal
6 period premium wages; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant rest
7 periods and/or pay rest period premium wages; failure to indemnify for all necessary expenditures
8 or losses incurred by employees in direct consequence of discharging their duties; failure to timely
9 pay earned wages during employment; and failure to provide complete and accurate wage
10 statements. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce
11 Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section
12 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

13 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

14 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
15 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
16 civil penalties on behalf of himself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
17 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars
18 (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
19 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
20 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
21 California, including but not limited to Los Angeles County at 2805 Gilroy Street, Los Angeles,
22 CA 90039.

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

27 **III. PARTIES**

28 4. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce

1 Development Agency on behalf of himself and other current and former employees subject to
2 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
3 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will
4 work for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
5 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the
6 currently named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was
7 employed by Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Los Angeles from
8 approximately January 2018 to present.

9 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant GIL & ROY
10 PROPS, LLC is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business in
11 the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-25 are, and at all times relevant hereto
12 were persons acting on behalf of Defendant GIL & ROY PROPS, LLC in the establishment of, or
13 ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant GIL &
14 ROY PROPS, LLC operates in Los Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved
15 employees in Los Angeles County, including but not limited to, at 2805 Gilroy Street, Los
16 Angeles, CA 90039.

17 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant GIL & ROY
18 STUDIOS, LLC is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business
19 in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 26-50 are, and at all times relevant hereto
20 were persons acting on behalf of Defendant GIL & ROY STUDIOS, LLC in the establishment of,
21 or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant GIL &
22 ROY STUDIOS, LLC operates in Los Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved
23 employees in Los Angeles County, including but not limited to, at 2805 Gilroy Street, Los
24 Angeles, CA 90039.

25 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant
26 MODERNICA, INC. is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing
27 business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 51-75 are, and at all times
28 relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant MODERNICA, INC. in the

1 establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies.
2 Defendant MODERNICA, INC. operates in Los Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and
3 aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County, including but not limited to, at 2805 Gilroy Street,
4 Los Angeles, CA 90039.

5 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 76-
6 100 through 50 are corporations, or are other business entities or organizations of a nature
7 unknown to Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California non-exempt employees,
8 permitted Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised control over the wages, hours
9 and working conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

10 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 1
11 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each of the individual defendants is sued
12 individually and in his or her capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner, representative, manager,
13 supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant who violated or caused to
14 be violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor Code and/or any provision of
15 the Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

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

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

25 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**
27 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

17. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more minutes per shift than Defendants credited them with having worked. Specifically, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages at the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to:

(a) "Rounding down" or "shaving down" Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' daily hours worked at the time of their clock-ins and clock-outs, including clock-ins and clock-outs for meal breaks, to the nearest quarter of an hour, to the benefit of Defendants.

18. Therefore, Defendants suffered, permitted, and required Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to be subject to Defendants' control without paying wages for that time. This resulted in Plaintiff and other current and former

1 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees working time for which they were not
2 compensated any wages, in violation of Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 and the applicable
3 Wage Order.

4 **19. Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay:**
5 Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt
6 employees. In California, an employer is required to pay hourly employees for all “hours worked,”
7 which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the
8 employee is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either
9 directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to the benefit of the employer.’

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

13 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40)
14 hours in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of
15 work in any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-
16 one-half (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve
17 (12) hours in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular
18 rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any
19 seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the
20 regular rate of pay of an employee.

21 Labor Code section 510.

22 **21.** In this case, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former
23 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees overtime wages for all overtime hours
24 worked due to Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to:

25 (a) “Rounding down” or “shaving down” Plaintiff’s and other current and former
26 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees’ daily hours worked at the time of their
27 clock-ins and clock-outs, including clock-ins and clock-outs for meal breaks, to the nearest quarter
28 of an hour, to the benefit of Defendants.

29 **22.** The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each
30 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
31 employees were under the control of Defendants but were not compensated. To the extent that the

1 foregoing uncompensated time occurred when Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
2 California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday,
3 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendants failed
4 to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code
5 sections 510 and 1194 and the applicable Wage Order.

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

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

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

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

1 (a) “Rounding down” or “shaving down” Plaintiff’s and other current and former
2 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees’ daily hours worked at the time of their
3 clock-ins and clock-outs, including clock-ins and clock-outs for meal breaks, to the nearest
4 quarter of an hour, to the benefit of Defendants; and

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

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

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

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

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

1 section 226.7; Wage Order 4 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of
2 each work period. Wage Order 4 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement “obligates
3 employers to permit – and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM*
4 *Security Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must
5 relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

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

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

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

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

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

27 35. **Failure to Indemnify for Losses and Expenditures Incurred as Part of**
28 **Employment:** California law requires that every employer must indemnify its employees for all

1 necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in discharge of his or her duties or at
2 the obedience of the directions of the employer. Moreover, an employer is prohibited from passing
3 the ordinary business expenses and losses of the employer onto the employee. (Lab. Code, §
4 2802.)

5 (a) Defendants have violated Labor Code Section 2802 by failing to indemnify
6 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees’
7 necessary expenditures they incurred in the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendants
8 employed a policy, practice, and procedure whereby Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were
9 required to maintain “When I Work” Application on their personal cell phone to use for purposes
10 of their employment (including cellular data and/or data use) for work-related purposes - without
11 reimbursing Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for such use.

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

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

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

28 39. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s claims above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed

1 to timely pay Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
2 exempt employees' earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period
3 premium wages, and/or rest period premium wages), in violation of Labor Code section 204.
4 Defendants' aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in their failure to pay
5 Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees'
6 their earned wages within the applicable time frames outlined in Labor Code section 204.

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

20 **41.** As a derivative of Plaintiff's allegations above, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff
21 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
22 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest
23 period premium wages) rendered Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-
24 based hourly non-exempt employees' wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code
25 section 226.

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

1 Labor Code section 2699.3.

2 43. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor
3 Code section 2699.3. On June 5, 2023, 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 44. 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 45. 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, 226, 226.7, 510,
14 512, 1194, 1197, 2802, During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present,
15 preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the
16 following amounts:

17 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226.7, 512, and
18 2802; one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial
19 violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each
20 subsequent violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

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

25 c. For violations of Labor Code section 510, 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].

d. For violations of Labor Code section 1194 and 1197, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 1197.1].

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

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 IWC Wages Orders as to the Plaintiff and aggrieved employees;

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

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

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

Dated: August 15, 2023

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

By:



Joseph Lavi, Esq.
N. Nick Ebrahimian, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Alan Wilcox, Esq.
Melanie S. Rodriguez, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
DAVID CARAVANTES,
on behalf of himself and current and former
aggrieved employees