

1 **BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.**

2 Bevin Pike (SBN 221936)

3 *bpike@tomorrowlaw.com*

4 Trisha Monesi (SBN 303512)

5 *tmonesi@tomorrowlaw.com*

6 1460 Westwood Boulevard

7 Los Angeles, California 90024

8 Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff JOSEPH PROSSER,
10 as an Aggrieved Employee, and on behalf of all other
11 Aggrieved Employees

12 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

13 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

14 JOSEPH PROSSER, as an Aggrieved
15 Employee, and on behalf of all other Aggrieved
16 Employees under the Labor Code Private
17 Attorneys' General Act of 2004,

18 Plaintiff

19 v.

20 AXILLON AEROSPACE (SAN DIEGO),
21 INC., a Delaware corporation; SK CAPITAL
22 PARTNERS, LP, a Delaware limited
23 partnership; SK CAPITAL PARTNERS, L.P.,
24 a Delaware limited partnership; SK CAPITAL
25 PARTNERS II, L.P., a Delaware limited
26 partnership; SK CAPITAL PARTNERS III,
27 L.P., a Delaware limited partnership; and
28 DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Superior Court of California,

County of San Diego

8/25/2026 10:48:27 AM

Clerk of the Superior Court

By G. Rodriguez ,Deputy Clerk

CASE NO.: 26CU000078C

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR:

**VIOLATIONS UNDER THE LABOR
CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS'
GENERAL ACT OF 2004 FOR CIVIL
PENALTIES UNDER LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1
and 2699**

[Amount in Controversy Greater Than
\$35,000.00]

1 Plaintiff JOSEPH PROSSER (“Plaintiff”), as an Aggrieved Employee, and on behalf of all
2 other Aggrieved Employees under the Labor Code Private Attorneys’ General Act of 2004, alleges
3 as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 1. This is a representative action, pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General
6 Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”), against Axillon Aerospace
7 (San Diego) Inc., and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of
8 California (“Axillon”) (hereinafter, Axillon, collectively, with DOES 1 through 100, as further
9 defined below, “Defendants”) as a proxy of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the
10 State of California (“LWDA”), on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees that worked for
11 Defendants during the PAGA Period. Specifically, in connection with any alleged claims for failure
12 to comply with Labor Code sections 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 233,
13 234, 245, 246, 432.5, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1198, and applicable
14 Wage Orders, Plaintiff seeks to represent all current and former employees that worked for
15 Defendants during the PAGA Period. On all other claims mentioned herein, Plaintiff seeks to
16 represent only non-exempt current and former employees that worked for Defendants during the
17 PAGA Period. Collectively, these employees are herein referred to as “Aggrieved Employees.” The
18 “PAGA Period” refers to one year preceding the date notice was submitted to the LWDA, continuing
19 past the date of notice to the LWDA until judgement is entered.

20 **PARTIES**

21 2. Plaintiff JOSEPH PROSSER is a resident of the State of California. At all relevant
22 times herein, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants employ
23 Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee. Plaintiff works as a production machinist with duties that
24 include, but are not limited to, computer navigated control operations. Plaintiff is informed and
25 believes, and based thereon alleges, that Plaintiff JOSEPH PROSSER has worked for Defendants
26 from approximately April of 2025 to the present.

27 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant Axillon
28 is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of

1 the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California.
2 At all relevant times herein, Axillon employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees within the
3 State of California.

4 4. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise,
5 of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff,
6 who therefore sues defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474.
7 Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the defendants designated
8 herein as DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein.
9 Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of
10 the defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known.

11 **JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS**

12 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each defendant
13 acted in all respects pertinent to this action, as the agent of the other defendant(s), carried out a joint
14 scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are
15 legally attributable to the other defendants. Whenever, heretofore or hereinafter, reference is made
16 to "Defendants," it shall include Axillon, and any of their parent, subsidiary, or affiliated companies
17 within the State of California, as well as DOES 1 through 100 identified herein.

18 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that all the times
19 mentioned herein, each of the Defendants was the agent, principal, employee, employer,
20 representative, joint venture or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, either actually or
21 ostensibly, and in doing the things alleged herein acted within the course and scope of such agency,
22 employment, joint venture, and conspiracy.

23 7. All of the acts and conduct described herein of each and every corporate defendant
24 was duly authorized, ordered, and directed by the respective and collective defendant corporate
25 employers, and the officers and management-level employees of said corporate employers. In
26 addition thereto, said corporate employers participated in the aforementioned acts and conduct of
27 their said employees, agents, and representatives, and each of them; and upon completion of the
28 aforesaid acts and conduct of said corporate employees, agents, and representatives, the defendant

1 corporation respectively and collectively ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded,
2 acquiesced, authorized, and otherwise approved of each and all of the said acts and conduct of the
3 aforementioned corporate employees, agents and representatives.

4 8. As a result of the aforementioned facts, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based
5 thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are joint employers.

6 **JURISDICTION**

7 9. Jurisdiction exists in the Superior Court of the State of California pursuant to Code
8 of Civil Procedure section 410.10.

9 10. Venue is proper in San Diego County, California pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure
10 sections 392, *et seq.* because, among other things, San Diego County is where the causes of action
11 complained of herein arose; the county in which the employment relationship began; the county in
12 which performance of the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff and Defendants was
13 due to be performed; the county in which the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff
14 and Defendants was actually performed; and the county in which Defendants, or some of them,
15 reside. Moreover, the unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and Aggrieved
16 Employees in San Diego County, and Defendants employ Aggrieved Employees in San Diego
17 County.

18 **PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ALLEGATIONS**

19 11. Plaintiff is an "Aggrieved Employee" under PAGA, as Plaintiff was employed by
20 Defendants during the PAGA Period and suffered the Labor Code violations set forth herein.
21 Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties under PAGA, plus reasonable attorneys' fees
22 and costs, for Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved Employees of Defendants during the PAGA Period.

23 12. Specifically, Plaintiff seeks to recover PAGA civil penalties through a representative
24 action permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in, among other authorities, *Arias v.*
25 *Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969. According to the same authorities, class certification of the
26 PAGA allegations described herein is not required.

27 13. Labor Code section 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g), authorizes Aggrieved Employees
28 such as Plaintiff to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures specified

1 in Labor Code section 2699.3 on behalf of Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved Employees within the
2 PAGA Period.

3 14. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, on or around January 2, 2026, Plaintiff
4 provided written notice of Defendants' violation of various provisions of the Labor Code to the
5 LWDA online and by certified mail, with return receipt requested, to Defendants ("PAGA Notice").

6 15. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a)(2)(A), the LWDA did not
7 provide notice of its intention to investigate Defendants' alleged violations within sixty-five (65)
8 calendar days of the PAGA Notice.

9 16. To the extent Defendants, or either of them, previously used the notice and cure
10 provision of Labor Code section 2699.3 within the last twelve months, under section 2699.3(d), then
11 Defendants, or those who have availed themselves of the cure provisions validly, are not eligible to
12 cure the violations discussed herein under section 2699.3 or otherwise use the early evaluation
13 conference process pursuant to section 2699.3(f).

14 17. In the event that Defendants, or either of them, is/are determined to have satisfied
15 sections 2699(g), 2699(h), or otherwise 2699(d)(1), Defendants, or any that is determined to have
16 satisfied sections 2699(g), 2699(h), is also, in the alternative, liable for civil penalties pursuant to
17 Labor Code sections 2699(j), 2699(e)(2), and 2699(f)(2).

18 18. In the event that Defendants, or either of them, is/are determined to have, prior to
19 this notice or a request for records pursuant to Labor Code section 226, 432, or 1198.5, from Plaintiff
20 and/or Plaintiff's counsel, adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all
21 provisions identified in this notice, said defendant(s) is/are still liable for civil penalties pursuant to
22 section 2699(g)(1)-(3).

23 19. In the event that Defendants, or either of them is/are deemed to have adequately taken
24 all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice within sixty (60)
25 days of receiving this notice, said defendant(s) is/are still liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor
26 Code section 2699(h)(1)-(3).

27 20. In the event, the LWDA and/or a court issued a finding or determination to the
28 Defendants, or either of them, that within five (5) years preceding the date of the PAGA Notice the

1 policies or practices which gave rise to the violations alleged herein were unlawful, Defendants, or
2 any of them, would be subject to heightened penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections
3 2699(f)(2)(B)(i), 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3) and **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either
4 Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h) for remedying violations either prior to or after the serving
5 of the PAGA Notice. Regardless, Plaintiff alleges Defendants' conduct giving rise to the violations
6 as detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. Thus, Defendants, or any of
7 them, are further subject to increased penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii) and lack
8 eligibility for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h).

9 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

10 21. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew,
11 or should have known, that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to receive wages for all
12 time worked, including regular, overtime, and double times wages, and that Plaintiff and Aggrieved
13 Employees were not receiving all wages owed for work that was required to be performed.

14 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had
15 and have a policy or practice of requiring Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to work more
16 than eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a
17 workweek (in violation of Labor Code sections 551 and 552) without paying them proper overtime
18 wages.

19 23. Upon information and belief, Defendants failed to accurately track and/or pay for all
20 minutes actually worked by Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees at the proper rates of pay.
21 Defendants also engaged, suffered, or permitted Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock,
22 including, without limitation, by requiring Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to complete pre-shift
23 tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, such as preliminary set ups or
24 cleaning machinery parts; clock out for meal periods and continue working; attend company
25 meetings and/or trainings off the clock to inform the next operator of how the prior shift went; and
26 to make and/or respond to phone calls off the clock. By way of example, Plaintiff and, upon
27 information and belief, Aggrieved Employees, are asked to complete preliminary set ups and clean
28 parts of machines prior to clocking in. Additionally, Plaintiff and, upon information and belief,

1 Aggrieved Employees, are asked to meet with their colleagues while off the clock in order to discuss
2 any pertinent information or functionality of the machines to prepare for the next shift.

3 24. Moreover, upon information and belief, Defendants detrimentally rounded, edited
4 and/or manipulated time entries so the hours recorded were less than the hours actually worked. By
5 way of example, Plaintiff noticed missing hours on his wage statements on multiple occasions.
6 Despite complaining to Human Resources, Plaintiff's concerns were ultimately ignored.

7 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
8 violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 223, 510, 551, 552, 1197, 1182.12, and applicable
9 Wage Orders based on its continued failure to pay minimum and overtime wages for all hours
10 worked. Thus, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to actual and liquidated
11 damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2, and 1198. Plaintiff is further
12 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such
13 violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendants would also be liable for civil
14 penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1197.1,
15 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Defendants would further
16 be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

17 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants, and
18 each of them, had and have a policy or practice of compelling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
19 Employees during the PAGA Period to work every day in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per
20 day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or
21 compensation in lieu thereof. By way of example, Defendants regularly denied Plaintiff and
22 Aggrieved Employees lawful meal periods by, without limitation, interrupting meal periods; not
23 providing timely meal periods; failing to provide second meal periods; and requiring Aggrieved
24 Employees to clock out for meal periods, but continue working. For example, Plaintiff is often
25 required to take his meal period late due to the fact he cannot stop operating a machine in time to
26 take a timely meal. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations.
27 Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
28 violated Labor Code sections 512 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the

1 PAGA Period, and thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their
2 regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7.
3 However, Plaintiff is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section
4 226.7 were not made for these non-compliant meal periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate
5 of pay. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for
6 failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of
7 compliant meal periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or
8 injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further informed and believes,
9 and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct that gave rise to such violations and was
10 malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such, Defendants are further liable for civil penalties
11 pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

12 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
13 maintain policies or practices of compelling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees every day to,
14 including, without limitation, work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without
15 authorizing and permitting Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted, timely,
16 and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the employees are completely relieved of all of their
17 duties. By way of example, Defendants regularly denied Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees lawful
18 rest periods by, without limitation, by failing to provide rest periods all together. Plaintiff and other
19 Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and
20 believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day
21 for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee
22 was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the
23 PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Plaintiff is informed and believes that
24 those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-
25 compliant rest periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code
26 sections 226.7 and 1198. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code
27 sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize
28 the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code

1 section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further
2 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such
3 violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such, Defendants are further liable for
4 civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

5 28. As a result of, among other things, Defendants' herein-described policy or practice
6 of failing to: accurately record time; failing to pay overtime and minimum wages; failing to provide
7 meal periods; failing to provide rest periods; and failing to provide compensation in lieu of meal or
8 rest periods, as described above, and due to independent failures in connection therewith, Plaintiff
9 is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants also intentionally failed and
10 continues to fail to furnish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements that
11 accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; the
12 inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; the name of the employee and only the
13 last four digits of their social security number or an employee identification number other than a
14 social security number; all deductions; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
15 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee; the legal name and
16 address of the employer, and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226,
17 subdivision (a). Specifically, Defendants intentionally failed to furnish employees with itemized
18 wage statements that accurately reflect the hours worked by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
19 Employees and the rates of pay at which they were or should have been paid, thus resulting in a
20 failure to reflect gross and net wages earned and paid at each rate, as well. Consequently, Plaintiff
21 is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated Labor Code sections
22 226, and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus
23 Plaintiff and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties
24 under Labor Code section 226 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. Plaintiff is
25 informed and believes that those penalties under Labor Code section 226 were not paid for these
26 violations of Labor Code section 226. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant
27 to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558, 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1)
28 and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants'

1 conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Thus,
2 Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
3 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

4 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants also
5 willfully or intentionally failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to timely pay
6 compensation to Plaintiff and other terminated or resigned employees, including but not limited to,
7 failing to pay all overtime wages owed; all minimum wages; all premium pay owed; all paid sick
8 leave, vacation pay and paid time off, as set forth above, among other things. Consequently, Plaintiff
9 is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated Labor Code sections
10 201, 202 203, and 1198 each pay period for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period,
11 and thus Plaintiff and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed
12 penalties under Labor Code section 203 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period.
13 However, Plaintiff is informed and believes that those penalties under Labor Code section 203 were
14 not made for these violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203. Defendants would thus be
15 liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief
16 under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(j). Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon
17 alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent,
18 or oppressive. As such, Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor
19 Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

20 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants also
21 failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without
22 limitation, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for the use of a
23 personal cellular phone for work purposes, and purchasing protective equipment such as nine
24 millimeter gloves and safety goggles in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of
25 their obedience to the directions of Defendants, as required by Labor Code sections 1198, 2800,
26 2802, and other statutory and common law offenses. As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
27 Employees have personally suffered these violations and Defendants are liable to reimburse Plaintiff
28 and other Aggrieved Employees for these costs incurred in furtherance of work duties. Defendants

1 would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or
2 injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further informed and believes,
3 and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was
4 malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such, Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties
5 pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

6 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had
7 and have a policy or practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees their paid
8 time off and vacation time owed upon separation of employment as wages at their final rate of pay
9 in violation of Labor Code section 227.3 and applicable Wage Orders. As such, Plaintiff and other
10 Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Defendants would be liable for
11 civil penalties for violation of Labor Code section 227.3 under Labor Code section 558, 1198 and
12 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further informed and
13 believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and
14 was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Therefore, Defendants would further be liable for civil
15 penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

16 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants had and
17 have a policy or practice of failing to pay Aggrieved Employees their wages in accordance with
18 Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days,
19 inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during
20 which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of
21 any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Plaintiff
22 is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants did not and do not pay Plaintiff
23 and other Aggrieved Employees all wages owed every day and every workweek in accordance with
24 Labor Code sections 204 and 1198. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges,
25 that Defendants violated Labor Code section 204 and that Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees
26 have personally suffered these violations. As such, Defendants would be liable for civil penalties
27 pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections
28 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that

1 Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or
2 oppressive. Therefore, Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code
3 section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

4 33. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
5 have or had a policy or practice of failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with
6 all rights afforded to them under the Healthy Workplace Healthy Families Act of 2014, codified at
7 Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*, including, without limitation, the amount of paid sick leave required
8 to be provided pursuant to California and local laws. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that
9 the sick pay was not provided at the proper regular of pay as required under California law due to
10 failure to properly calculate the regular rate. Plaintiff is additionally informed and believes that the
11 notice requirement of Labor Code section 221, 223, 233, 234, 245 and 246 involves a mandatory
12 payroll or workplace injury reporting. Plaintiff is thus informed and believes that Defendants
13 violated these Labor Code sections, as well as Labor Code section 1198. As such, Plaintiff and
14 other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations under these sections and
15 Defendants would be liable for civil penalties for violation of the paid sick leave regulations under
16 Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, as well as equitable, injunctive, or restitutionary relief, and
17 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. Plaintiff further informed and believes, and based thereon
18 alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent,
19 or oppressive. Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
20 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

21 34. In addition to the above, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges
22 that Defendants failed and continue to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage
23 statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to
24 obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code
25 section 1198.5, time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Plaintiff and
26 other Aggrieved Employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Plaintiff
27 and the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, which in turn would entitle
28 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and

1 1198.5. Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558,
2 1174.5, and 2699. Plaintiff further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
3 Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or
4 oppressive. Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
5 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

6 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants,
7 including their agents, managers, superintendents, and/or officers, required Plaintiff and/or
8 Aggrieved Employees to agree, in writing, to terms and conditions known by Defendants (and its
9 agents, managers, superintendents and/or officers) to be prohibited by law, including, without
10 limitation, terms known to be illegal in purported arbitration agreements, purported confidentiality
11 agreements, and other written documents presented for signature and/or assent to Plaintiff and/or
12 Aggrieved Employees by Defendants. Defendants also required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees
13 to inform prospective employers of Defendants' restrictions of Plaintiff's and Aggrieved
14 Employees' freedom to work. As a result, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants violated
15 Labor Code sections 432.5 and 1198. As such, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon
16 alleges, that Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that
17 Defendants violated, without limitation, Labor Code section 432.5 and Government Code section
18 12952, entitling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to damages. Plaintiff is further informed
19 and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations
20 and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties
21 pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.5, 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections
22 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor
23 Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

24 36. Plaintiff, in Plaintiff's representative capacity, seeks civil penalties under Labor
25 Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699 for the herein-described acts, which violate
26 the California Labor Code as described above, including on behalf of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
27 Employees pursuant to PAGA.
28

1 **FIRST AND ONLY CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys' General Act (2004) – Against All Defendants)**

3 37. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations set forth in the
4 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

5 **Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 210**

6 38. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 204, requires and required that:
7 “[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for
8 between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor
9 performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for
10 between the 1st and 10th day of the following month.”

11 39. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a) states and stated
12 that “[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this
13 article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3,
14 204, 204b, 204.1, 205, 205.5, and 1197.5, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any
15 initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee” and “(2) For
16 each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for
17 each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.”

18 40. At all relevant times herein, Defendants have had a consistent policy or practice of
19 failing to pay Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees during their employment on a timely basis as
20 per Labor Code section 204 including, without limitation, for the reasons and in a manner set forth
21 in the preceding paragraphs. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 210, Plaintiff and other
22 Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover as civil penalties injunctive relief and monetary civil
23 penalties in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial
24 violation per employee, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus
25 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent
26 violation in connection with each payment that was made in violation of Labor Code section 204.

1 to recover underpaid wages;

2 (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid
3 employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to
4 an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages;

5 (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee.”

6 46. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants, and
7 each of them, violated, or caused to be violated, the Labor Code sections and Wage Orders
8 regulating wages, hours and days of work described herein, including but not limited to Labor Code
9 sections 201-204, 223, 226.7, 510, 511, 512, 551, 552, 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2802.

10 47. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
11 pursuant to Labor Code section 558, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover
12 civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount fifty dollars
13 (\$50) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars
14 (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

15 Violation of Labor Code § 1174.5

16 48. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (b) has
17 required every person employing labor in California to “[a]llow any member of the commission or
18 the employees of the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement free access to the place of business
19 or employment of the person to secure any information or make any investigation that they are
20 authorized by this chapter to ascertain or make. The commission may inspect or make excerpts,
21 relating to the employment of employees, from the books, reports, contracts, payrolls, documents,
22 or papers of the person.”

23 49. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (c) has required
24 every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep a record showing the names and addresses of
25 all employees employed and the ages of all minors.”

26 50. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d) has required
27 every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep, at a central location in the state or at the
28 plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours

1 worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and applicable
2 piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records
3 shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any
4 case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee
5 from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units
6 earned.”

7 51. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, “[a]ny person employing labor who willfully
8 fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of [Labor Code] Section 1174 or accurate
9 and complete records required by subdivision (d) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, or to allow any
10 member of the commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to subdivision
11 (b) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).

12 52. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants have
13 willfully failed to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar
14 payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment
15 under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records
16 under Labor Code section 1174.

17 53. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
18 pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
19 recover civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of five
20 hundred dollars (\$500) per violation per pay period per Aggrieved Employee.

21 Violation of Labor Code § 1197.1

22 54. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, subdivision (a): “Any employer or other
23 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, who pays
24 or causes to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or
25 local law, or by an order of the commission shall be subject to a civil penalty, restitution of wages,
26 liquidated damages payable to the employee, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
27 Section 203 as follows:

28 (1) For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars

1 (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
2 employee is underpaid. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
3 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
4 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

5 (2) For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty
6 dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
7 employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is
8 intentionally committed. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
9 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
10 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

11 (3) Wages, liquidated damages, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
12 Section 203, recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected
13 employee.”

14 55. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants caused
15 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees not to be paid minimum wages as a result of Defendants
16 routinely failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked by Plaintiff and
17 Aggrieved Employees at the proper rates of pay, as described above.

18 56. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
19 pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
20 recover civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of one
21 hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and
22 two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each
23 subsequent violation.

24 Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 2699

25 57. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), notwithstanding any other
26 provision of law, any provision of the Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed
27 and collected by the LWDA or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or
28 employees for a violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil

1 action brought by an Aggrieved Employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former
2 employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

3 58. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and
4 each of them, violated the Labor Code sections described in the preceding paragraphs.

5 59. As such, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to injunctive relief, one
6 hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee for each pay period in the PAGA Period, and
7 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each Aggrieved Employee for each pay period in the PAGA Period
8 to the extent Defendants' conduct is found to be malicious, fraudulent and/or oppressive.

9 60. Moreover, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees within the State of California
10 whom Plaintiff seeks to represent are entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in
11 connection with their herein-described claims for civil penalties.

12 **PRAYER**

13 **WHEREFORE**, on behalf of Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff prays for
14 judgment against Defendants as follows:

15 A. An award of civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558,
16 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;

17 B. An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections
18 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;

19 C. For equitable, including, without limitation, injunctive relief;

20 C. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;

21 D. For costs of suit incurred herein; and;

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

E. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: August 13, 2026

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

BY: /s/ Trisha Monesi
BEVIN PIKE
TRISHA MONESI
Attorneys for Plaintiff JOSEPH PROSSER
and on behalf of all other Aggrieved
Employees

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within action; my mailing address is 1460 Westwood Boulevard Los Angeles, California 90024.

On **August 13, 2026**, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing document(s) described as **VIOLATIONS UNDER THE LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS' GENERAL ACT OF 2004 FOR CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER LABOR CODE SECTIONS 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1 and 2699**, to be served on the following person(s):

**NELSON MULLINS RILEY &
SCARBOROUGH LLP**
Mikaela M. Critchlow (SBN: 328513)
mikaela.critchlow@nelsonmullins.com
750 B Street, Suite 2200
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: 619.489.6110
Facsimile: 619.821.2834

Attorneys for Defendant
AXILLON AEROSPACE (SAN DIEGO),
INC.

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
Dixon Carvalho Anderson (SBN: 333894)
Dixon.CarvalhoAnderson@lw.com
10250 Constellation Blvd Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: (424) 653-5674
Facsimile: (424) 653-5501

Attorneys for Defendants
SK CAPITAL PARTNERS, LP, SK
CAPITAL PARTNERS, L.P., SK CAPITAL
PARTNERS II, L.P., and SK CAPITAL
PARTNERS III, L.P.

☒ **BY E-MAIL OR ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION:**

Based on a Court order or on an agreement by the parties to accept service by e-mail or electronic transmission, I caused the document(s) described above to be electronically served to the persons at the e-mail address listed below. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on **August 13, 2026**, at Los Angeles, California.



Xochitl Tapia