

1 David Alami (State Bar No. 314628)
2 david@alamilawgroup.com
3 Shaheen Anthony Etemadi (State Bar No. 319138)
4 shawn@alamilawgroup.com
5 **ALAMI LAW GROUP, APC**
6 620 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1100
7 Newport Beach, CA 92660
8 Telephone: (949) 287-3594

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
9/29/2023 3:41 PM
Superior Court of California
County of Mendocino

By:
John Lozano
Deputy Clerk



Attorneys for Plaintiff SARIESA F. HIPES

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF MENDOCINO**

SARIESA F. HIPES, an individual, on behalf of
herself, all other aggrieved employees, and the
State of California,

Plaintiff,

v.

TAPESTRY FAMILY SERVICES, INC.;
NATALIE SHEPARD; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 23CV00981

**REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF
THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT OF 2004 (CAL. LAB.
CODE §§ 2698, *ET SEQ.*)**

1 Plaintiff SARIESA F. HIPES (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of other aggrieved
2 employees, hereby brings this representative action Complaint pursuant to the Private Attorneys
3 General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”), California Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq.*, against TAPESTRY
4 FAMILY SERVICES, INC.; NATALIE SHEPARD; and DOES 1 through 10 inclusive (collectively,
5 “Defendants”), and hereby alleges with knowledge with respect to her own acts and on information
6 and belief as to other matters as follows:

7 **INTRODUCTION**

8 1. This representative PAGA action, pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq.*, is
9 brought by Plaintiff on behalf of herself and all current and former employees of Defendants employed
10 in California during the PAGA Period (collectively, “Aggrieved Employees”). The term “PAGA
11 Period” is defined as commencing from one year prior to the submission of Plaintiff’s notice of Labor
12 Code violations to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendants
13 through the date of final judgment.

14 2. During the PAGA Period, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were employed by
15 Defendants and performed work for Defendants in Mendocino County.

16 3. Defendants have engaged in a systematic pattern of wage and hour violations under the
17 California Labor Code (“Labor Code”). During the PAGA Period, Defendants maintained a consistent
18 practice and policy of violating state wage and hour laws by, among other things, failing to pay all
19 wages (including sick pay, vacation pay, minimum, regular, overtime, and/or double time wages),
20 failing to provide compliant meal and rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof, failing to timely
21 pay all wages due upon separation of employment, failing to provide accurate itemized wage
22 statements, failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked, and failing to reimburse business
23 expenses.

24 4. Plaintiff’s representative PAGA action is brought under, *inter alia*, the California
25 Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Orders and applicable provisions of the California
26 Code of Regulations, California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5, and Labor Code Sections
27 201, 202, 203, 204, 206, 210, 221, 223, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 233, 234, 246, 510, 511, 512, 558,
28 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2800, and 2802.

5. Plaintiff brings this representative action on behalf of herself and other Aggrieved Employees and seeks civil penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs pursuant to Labor Code Sections 1194.2 and 2698, *et seq.* against Defendants.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This Court has jurisdiction over all causes of action asserted herein pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the superior courts original jurisdiction in all cases except those given to other trial courts. The sole cause of action alleged in this Complaint arises under California law. Further, this is a representative PAGA action and the monetary damages, restitution, penalties, and other amounts sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdictional limit of this Court and will be established according to proof at trial. In addition, PAGA penalties cannot be aggregated to meet the jurisdictional threshold for diversity jurisdiction in federal court.

7. This Court has personal jurisdiction over all Defendants because each defendant has sufficient minimum contacts with California, having intentionally availed itself of the California forum so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by this Court consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

8. Venue in Mendocino County is proper under California Business & Professions Code Section 17203 and California Code of Civil Procedure Section 395.5 because a substantial part of Defendants' unlawful conduct, acts, and omissions alleged in this Complaint occurred in this County, Defendants conduct substantial business in this County, and/or Defendants' liability arose in this County.

PARTIES

9. Plaintiff SARIESA F. HIPES is an individual residing in California. Defendants employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt hourly employee during the PAGA Period and Plaintiff's employment with Defendants ended within one (1) year of the filing of this action. Plaintiff's job duties included, *inter alia*, providing support for clients with mental health issues (e.g., schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, etc.).

10. Defendant TAPESTRY FAMILY SERVICES, INC. is a California corporation doing business throughout the state of California. TAPESTRY FAMILY SERVICES, INC. is, and at all

1 relevant times was, an employer subject to California state wage and hour laws. Plaintiff is informed,
2 believes, and thereon alleges that the practices and policies TAPESTRY FAMILY SERVICES, INC.
3 that are complained of by way of this Complaint were implemented during the PAGA Period.

4 11. Defendant NATALIE SHEPARD is an individual residing in California. NATALIE
5 SHEPARD is, and at all relevant times was, an employer subject to California state wage and hour
6 laws. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that the practices and policies NATALIE
7 SHEPARD that are complained of by way of this Complaint were implemented during the PAGA
8 Period. Defendant NATALIE SHEPARD was involved in the day-to-day operations of Defendants'
9 business operations, including implementing practices that violated or caused to be violated the
10 Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order provisions regulating minimum wages or hours
11 and days of work, as well as Labor Code Sections 203, 226, 226.7, 1194, and 2802. Therefore,
12 NATALIE SHEPARD is liable for these Labor Code and IWC Wage Order violations pursuant to
13 Labor Code Section 558.1.

14 12. Defendants continue to employ non-exempt employees within California.

15 13. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names and capacities of those Defendants identified as
16 DOES 1 through 10. Therefore, Plaintiff identifies those Defendants fictitiously. Each DOE
17 Defendant was a parent, sister, or related corporate entity of Defendants, or an owner, employee or
18 agent of Defendants, and each related entity, and was acting with the knowledge and authorization of
19 each of the other Defendants. Plaintiff will seek to amend this Complaint to allege the true names and
20 capacities of each DOE Defendant when their names have been ascertained and identified. Each of the
21 Defendants sued as DOES 1 through 10 participated in, received the benefit of, or was in some way
22 responsible for one or more of the wrongful acts and omissions and some portion of the damages
23 alleged herein.

24 14. At all times relevant hereto, each defendant acted in all respects pertinent to this action
25 as the agent of the other defendants, carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respects
26 pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally attributable to the other defendants.
27 Furthermore, Defendants in all respects acted as the employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and
28 the Aggrieved Employees.

15. Defendants, each and all of them, at all times relevant, were the joint employers, parent companies, successor companies, predecessors in interest, affiliates, agents, employees, servants, joint venturers, directors, fiduciaries, representatives, and/or co-conspirators of each of the remaining Defendants. Defendants, unless otherwise alleged, at all times relevant, performed all acts and omissions alleged herein within the course and scope of said relationship(s), and are a proximate cause of Plaintiff's damages alleged herein.

16. There exists a unity of interest in ownership between Defendants and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, such that any individuality and separateness between the individual and the corporation does not exist, as Defendants, and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, are alter egos, in that: (a) Defendants are and at all times mentioned herein were mere shells, instrumentalities and conduits through which DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, carried out their business in the business name, exercising complete control and dominance over such business; (b) that Defendants were conceived, intended and used by DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, as devices to avoid individual liability and in place of Defendants, and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, and were without the financial solvency and responsibility required by law; and (c) that all of the assets of the Defendants have been transferred to DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, or some other individual or entity which he or she owns or controls, with the intent to hinder, delay or defraud creditors of Defendants, leaving Defendants with no assets. Further, there exists a principal-agency relationship between and among Defendants.

17. At all relevant times, Defendants were agents of each other and acting within the course and scope of their agency.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

18. At all relevant times, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees as non-exempt employees.

19. At all relevant times, Defendants were advised by skilled lawyers, employees and other professionals who were knowledgeable about California wage and hour law, employment and personnel practices, and the requirements of California.

20. Through this action, Plaintiff alleges Defendants have consistently maintained and enforced unlawful employment practices and policies against Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees

1 which violate the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

2 21. Defendants knew or should have known they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and/or
3 other Aggrieved Employees, and Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation but
4 willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so to increase Defendants' profits.

5 22. **Unpaid Wages:** Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other
6 Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive at least minimum wages, wages at their regular rate of
7 pay, overtime and double time wages, and that they were not receiving minimum, regular, overtime,
8 and double time wages for all work that was required to be performed. On information and belief,
9 during the PAGA Period, Aggrieved Employees regularly worked more than 8 hours, 10 hours, and/or
10 12 hours per workday and/or over 40 hours per workweek. Defendants' practices and policies deprived
11 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees of minimum, regular, overtime, and/or double time wages
12 for work they performed off the clock. Defendants required Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees
13 to complete workrelated tasks off the clock, such as communicating with Defendants, preparing billing
14 and workrelated notes, and travel time. Furthermore, Defendants rounded Plaintiff and other
15 Aggrieved Employees' hours worked, thereby depriving them of wages for all hours worked at the
16 legally mandated rates. Defendants did not compensate Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for
17 all hours worked because Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were regularly on-duty during their
18 meal and/or rest periods. Finally, Defendants failed to accurately calculate the regular rate of pay by
19 failing to include a remuneration when calculating the rate of pay for overtime, double time, meal and
20 rest period premiums, vacation pay, and sick pay. Accordingly, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and
21 other Aggrieved Employees the proper sick pay, vacation pay, and minimum, regular, overtime, and
22 double time wages for all hours worked in violation of the Labor Code, the applicable IWC Wage
23 Orders, and California Code of Regulations.

24 23. **Meal Period Violations:** Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and/or
25 other Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive a timely, off-duty, uninterrupted 30-minute meal
26 period for every five hours of work, or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of
27 pay when they did not receive a compliant meal period. Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees
28 frequently had their meal periods shortened, interrupted, late, and/or missed altogether due to

Defendants' practice of understaffing and prioritizing work demands over taking compliant breaks. Defendants also failed to relieve Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees of all duties during their meal periods. In addition, Defendants failed to authorize and permit and/or make available to Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees second meal periods when they worked more than 10 hours. Moreover, Defendants rounded Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees' time punches for meal periods. Accordingly, Defendants failed to authorize and permit and/or make available to Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees timely, uninterrupted off-duty meal periods for at least 30 minutes when they worked more than five (5) hours and/or 10 hours in a workday, and failed to compensate Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees with an additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for every day in which they were denied a compliant meal period.

24. **Rest Period Violations:** Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive a 10-minute, off-duty, uninterrupted rest period for every four (4) hours worked, or major fraction thereof, or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when they were not permitted to take a compliant rest period. Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees missed their rest breaks or had them interrupted or governed by Defendants' practices and policies. Defendants also failed to relieve Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees of all duties during their meal periods. Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees also failed to adopt and implement a practice of providing third rest breaks when Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees worked over 10 hours. Notwithstanding the above rest break violations, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees with an additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for every day in which they suffered a rest period violation.

25. **Unreimbursed Business Expenses:** Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were entitled to reimbursement for their necessary work-related business expenses. First, Defendants required Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to use their personal cell phones to discuss work-related matters with Defendants' representatives and for other work purposes without any reimbursement. Second, Defendants required Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to use their personal vehicles to commute to and from Defendants' various jobsites to complete work-related duties, without full reimbursement for mileage and related costs.

1 26. **Failure to Permit Aggrieved Employees to Use Accrued and Available Sick Leave:**
2 During the PAGA Period, Defendants failed to permit Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees to use
3 their accrued and available sick leave entitlement.

4 27. **Failure to Provide Sick Pay:** During the PAGA Period, Defendants failed to provide
5 Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees sick pay at the legally mandated rate.

6 28. **Failure to Pay Vacation Wages:** During the PAGA Period, Defendants failed to
7 provide to Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees accrual of vacation wages and failed to pay to
8 Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees vested vacation wages.

9 29. **Waiting Time Penalties:** Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and
10 other Aggrieved Employees who separated from their employment with Defendants during the
11 statutory period were entitled to timely payment of all wages due. In violation of the Labor Code,
12 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive payment of all wages owed upon separation
13 within the permissible time period due to, *inter alia*, Defendants' failure to pay all wages, meal and
14 rest period premiums, and reimburse expenses.

15 30. **Wage Statement Violations:** Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff
16 and/or other Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive complete and accurate wage statements.
17 In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were
18 not furnished with complete and accurate wage statements that show all information required by Labor
19 Code Section 226, including, but not limited to, the gross and net wages earned, the total hours worked,
20 all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, and the corresponding number of hours
21 worked at each hourly rate.

22 31. **Failure to Keep Accurate Records:** Defendants knew or should have known that
23 Defendants were required to keep accurate records of the hours worked by Plaintiff and/or other
24 Aggrieved Employees. In violation of the Labor Code, Defendants failed to maintain accurate records
25 of hours worked by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees as a result of Defendants' conduct, acts,
26 and/or omissions described throughout this Complaint.

27 32. Defendants' conduct, acts, and/or omissions described throughout this Complaint were
28 willful.

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004**

3 **(CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 2698, *ET SEQ.*)**

4 **(Against All Defendants)**

5 33. Plaintiff incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as though
6 fully set forth herein.

7 34. Under Labor Code Section 2699(a), any provision of the Labor Code that provides for
8 a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA or any of its departments, divisions,
9 commissions, boards, agencies or employees for violation of the code may, as an alternative, can be
10 recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and
11 other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code Section 2699.3.

12 35. Under Labor Code Section 2699.3(a), a plaintiff may bring a cause of action under
13 PAGA only after giving the LWDA and the employer notice of the Labor Code Sections alleged to
14 have been violated, and after receiving notice from the LWDA of its intention not to investigate or
15 after 65 days have passed without notice from the LWDA.

16 36. On July 13, 2023, Plaintiff gave written notice of the specified provisions alleged to
17 have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations, as required by
18 Labor Code Section 2699.3. This written notice was provided via certified mail to Defendants and to
19 the LWDA by electronically filing the notice via the Department of Industrial Relations' website.
20 More than 65 days have passed since Plaintiff submitted the PAGA notice to the LWDA without notice
21 from the LWDA. Accordingly, Plaintiff has exhausted the procedural requirements under Labor Code
22 Section 2699.3 as to Defendants and is therefore able to pursue a claim for penalties on behalf of
23 herself and all other Aggrieved Employees under PAGA.

24 37. For all provisions of the Labor Code except those for which a civil penalty is
25 specifically provided, Labor Code Section 2699(f) imposes upon Defendants a penalty of one hundred
26 dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred
27 dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent pay period in which
28 Defendants violated these provisions of the Labor Code.

1 38. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, Plaintiff may seek civil penalties
2 for any alleged violation of the following provisions: subdivision (k) of Section 96, Sections 98.6, 201,
3 201.3, 201.5, 201.7, 202, 203, 203.1, 203.5, 204, 204a, 204b, 204.1, 204.2, 205, 205.5, 206, 206.5,
4 208, 209, and 212, subdivision (d) of Section 213, Sections 221, 222, 222.5, 223, and 224, paragraphs
5 (1) to (5), inclusive, (7), and (9) of subdivision (a) of Section 226, Sections 226.7, 227, 227.3, 230,
6 230.1, 230.2, 230.3, 230.4, 230.7, 230.8, and 231, subdivision (c) of Section 232, subdivision (c) of
7 Section 232.5, Sections 233, 234, 351, 353, and 403, subdivision (b) of Section 404, Sections 432.2,
8 432.5, 432.7, 435, 450, 510, 511, 512, 513, 551, 552, 601, 602, 603, 604, 750, 751.8, 800, 850, 851,
9 851.5, 852, 921, 922, 923, 970, 973, 976, 1021, 1021.5, 1025, 1026, 1101, 1102, 1102.5, and 1153,
10 subdivisions (c) and (d) of Section 1174, Sections 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.5, and 1198, subdivision
11 (b) of Section 1198.3, Sections 1199, 1199.5, 1290, 1292, 1293, 1293.1, 1294, 1294.1, 1294.5, 1296,
12 1297, 1298, 1301, 1308, 1308.1, 1308.7, 1309, 1309.5, 1391, 1391.1, 1391.2, 1392, 1683, and 1695,
13 subdivision (a) of Section 1695.5, Sections 1695.55, 1695.6, 1695.7, 1695.8, 1695.9, 1696, 1696.5,
14 1696.6, 1697.1, 1700.25, 1700.26, 1700.31, 1700.32, 1700.40, and 1700.47, Sections 1735, 1771,
15 1774, 1776, 1777.5, 1811, 1815, 2651, and 2673, subdivision (a) of Section 2673.1, Sections 2695.2,
16 2800, 2801, 2802, 2806, and 2810, subdivision (b) of Section 2929, and Sections 3073.6, 6310, 6311,
17 6399.7, 6400, 6401, 6401.7, 6402, and 6403.

18 39. Labor Code Section 558(a) provides “[a]ny employer or other person acting on behalf
19 of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision
20 regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject
21 to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid
22 employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid . . . (2) For each subsequent
23 violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
24 employee was underpaid.”

25 40. Labor Code Section 1197.1 provides “[a]ny employer or other person acting either
26 individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, who pays or causes to be paid to
27 any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or local law, or by an order
28 of the commission shall be subject to a civil penalty . . . as follows: (1) For any initial violation that is

1 intentionally committed, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period
2 for which the employee is underpaid . . . (2) For each subsequent violation for the same specific
3 offense, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which
4 the employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is intentionally committed.”

5 41. Labor Code Section 226.3 provides: “[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a) of
6 Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per
7 employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each
8 violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage
9 deduction statement or fails to keep the records required in subdivision (a) of Section 226. The civil
10 penalties provided for in this section are in addition to any other penalty provided by law.”

11 42. Labor Code Section 1174.5 provides a \$500 penalty for an employer’s failure to
12 maintain accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid
13 to employees.

14 43. Defendants’ conduct with respect to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees violates
15 numerous Labor Code sections including, but not limited to, the following:

16 (a) Violation of Labor Code Sections 201-204, 206, 210, 221, 223, 227.3, 246, 510,
17 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198 for failure to timely pay all earned wages (including minimum,
18 regular, overtime, and double time wages), sick pay, and vacation pay owed to Plaintiff and other
19 aggrieved employees during employment and upon separation of employment;

20 (b) Violation of Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512 for failure to provide meal
21 periods to Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees and failure to pay premium wages for missed
22 meal periods;

23 (c) Violation of Labor Code Section 226.7 for failure to permit rest breaks to
24 Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees and failure to pay premium wages for missed rest periods;

25 (d) Violation of Labor Code Sections 226 and 226.3 for failure to provide accurate
26 itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees;

27 (e) Violation of Labor Code Sections 226, 226.3, 1174, and 1174.5 for failure to
28 calculate and pay sick pay at the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which Plaintiff and/or other

1 Aggrieved Employees used paid sick time, or by dividing the Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved
2 Employees' total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved
3 Employees' total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment, in violation
4 of Labor Code Sections 246, 246.5, 247, 247.5, and 248.5 and the Healthy Workplaces, Healthy
5 Families Act of 2014;

6 (f) Violation of Labor Code Section 227.3 for failure to provide to Plaintiff and/or
7 Aggrieved Employees accrual of vacation wages and failure to pay to Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved
8 Employees vested vacation wages;

9 (g) Violation of Labor Code Sections 221 and 223 for secretly paying Plaintiff
10 and/or Aggrieved Employees less than the statutory or contractual rate;

11 (h) Violation of Labor Code Sections 1174 and 1174.5 for failure to maintain
12 accurate records regarding the employment of Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees;

13 (i) Violation of Labor Code Sections 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse
14 business expenses to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees; and

15 (j) Violation of Labor Code Section 1199 for each of the foregoing Labor Code
16 violations.

17 44. As set forth above, Defendants have violated numerous provisions of the Labor Code
18 regulating hours and days of work as well as the IWC Wage Orders.

19 45. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2699(a), 2699.3, and 2699.5, Plaintiff is entitled to
20 recover civil penalties, in addition to other remedies, for violations of the Labor Code Sections cited
21 above.

22 46. Plaintiff is an "aggrieved employee" because she was employed by Defendants and had
23 one or more of the alleged violations committed against her, and therefore is properly suited to
24 represent the interests of all other aggrieved employees.

25 47. Plaintiff has exhausted the procedural requirements under Labor Code Section 2699.3
26 as to Defendants and is therefore able to pursue a claim for penalties on behalf of herself and all other
27 aggrieved employees under the PAGA.

28 48. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2699(g) and 2802(c) and California Code of Civil

1 Procedure Section 1021.5, Plaintiff is entitled to attorneys' fees and costs incurred in this action.

2 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

3 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the other Aggrieved Employees, prays for
4 judgment and the following specific relief against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

5 1. For civil penalties against Defendants on behalf of Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved
6 Employees pursuant to, *inter alia*, Labor Code Sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2698, *et*
7 *seq.*;

8 2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit to the extent permitted by law, including
9 pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2699(g) and 2802(c), and California Code of Civil Procedure Section
10 1021.5; and

11 3. For such other relief the Court deems just and proper.

12
13 Dated: September 28, 2023

ALAMI LAW GROUP, APC

14
15
16 By: 

David Alami

Shaheen Anthony Etemadi

Attorneys for Plaintiff SARIESA F. HIPES