

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Superior Court of California,
County of Kern

By: Julia Barrera
Deputy Clerk

05/28/26 9:28 AM

STANSBURY BROWN LAW
DANIEL J. BROWN (SBN 307604)
dbrown@stansburybrownlaw.com
GREGORY K. OKADA (SBN 352303)
gokada@stansburybrownlaw.com
2610 ½ Abbot Kinney Blvd.
Venice, CA 90291
Tel: 323-207-5925

Attorney for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF KERN

NURIS MEDINA, as an individual and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ACE FARM LABOR CONTRACTING,
INC., a California corporation; SUN PACIFIC
FARMING COOPERATIVE, INC., a
California corporation; and DOES 1 through
100,

Defendants.

Case No.: 26CUB00713

Amended as a Matter of Right Pursuant to
Labor Code Section 2699.3(a)(2)(C)

*[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon.
Thomas S. Clark]*

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

- (1) MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 1182.12, 1194,
1194.2, AND 1197);**
- (2) FAILURE TO PAY ALL
OVERTIME WAGES (LABOR
CODE §§ 204, 510, 551, 552, 558,
1194, AND 1198);**
- (3) MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512);**
- (4) REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 516);**
- (5) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE FOR
NECESSARY BUSINESS
EXPENSES (LABOR CODE § 2802);**
- (6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE
ACCURATE, ITEMIZED WAGE
STATEMENTS (LABOR CODE
§ 226 *et seq.*);**
- (7) WAITING TIME PENALTIES
(LABOR CODE §§ 201-203);**
- (8) UNFAIR COMPETITION (BUS &
PROF CODE § 17200 *et seq.*); AND**

**(9) CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT (LABOR CODE § et seq.).**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE**

1 Plaintiff Nuris Medina (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,
2 hereby brings this Class Action Complaint (“Complaint”) against Ace Farm Labor Contracting,
3 Inc., a California corporation; Sun Pacific Farming Cooperative, Inc. and, DOES 1 to 100,
4 inclusive (collectively “Defendants”), and on information and belief alleges as follows:

5 **JURISDICTION**

6 1. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, hereby brings this
7 Complaint for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under California Business & Professions
8 Code § 17200 *et. seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-205, 226 *et seq.*, 226.7, 510, 512, 516, 551-552, 558,
9 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 2802, 2698 *et seq.*; and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage
10 Order 14 (“Wage Order 14”), in addition to seeking declaratory relief and restitution. This
11 Complaint is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. This Court has
12 jurisdiction over Defendants’ violations of the California Labor Code because the amount in
13 controversy exceeds this Court’s jurisdictional minimum.

14 **VENUE**

15 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. §§
16 395(a) and 395.5, as the events giving rise to this Complaint occurred in Kern County, and one
17 or more of the Defendants own, maintain offices, transact business, have agent(s) within the
18 County of Kern, and/or otherwise are found within the County of Kern, and Defendants are within
19 the jurisdiction of this Court for purposes of service of process.

20 **PARTIES**

21 3. Plaintiff is an individual over the age of eighteen (18). At all relevant times herein,
22 Plaintiff was and currently is, a California resident. During the four years immediately preceding
23 the filing of the Complaint in this action and within the statute of limitations periods applicable
24 to each cause of action pled herein, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt
25 employee. Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants’ policies and/or practices complained of
26 herein, lost money and/or property, and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed by Labor Code
27 §§ 201-205, 226 *et seq.*, 226.7, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198, 2802,
28 2698 *et seq.*; California Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* (“Unfair Competition

1 Law”); and Wage Order 14, which sets employment standards for Agricultural Occupations.

2 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the four
3 years preceding the filing of the Complaint and continuing to the present, Defendants did (and
4 continue to do) business by employing seasonal farm labor employees to harvest agricultural
5 commodities in the United States, and employed Plaintiff and other, similarly-situated non-
6 exempt employees within Kern County and the state of California and, therefore, were (and are)
7 doing business in Kern County and the State of California.

8 5. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner,
9 or corporate, of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 100, inclusive, and for that reason, said
10 defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to
11 amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed,
12 and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious defendants, whether individual,
13 partners, or corporate, were responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein,
14 and proximately caused Plaintiff and the Classes (as defined herein) to be subject to the unlawful
15 employment practices, wrongs, injuries and damages complained of herein.

16 6. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned
17 herein, Defendants were and are the employers of Plaintiff and all members of the Classes.

18 7. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing
19 of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants; and furthermore, the
20 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each and every one of
21 the other Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned
22 were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment. Defendants, and each
23 of them, approved of, condoned, and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts or
24 omissions complained of herein.

25 8. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of
26 and engaged in a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course
27 and scope of and in pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise. Further,
28 Plaintiff alleges that all Defendants were joint employers for all purposes of Plaintiff and all

1 members of the Classes.

2 9. Defendant Sun Pacific Farming Cooperative, Inc., a citrus grower, is also jointly
3 liable with Defendant Ace Farm Labor Contracting, Inc., (the farm labor contractor who secured
4 Plaintiff's services for Sun Pacific Farming Cooperative, Inc.) for all civil legal responsibility and
5 civil liability for the payment of wages, including all sums payable to an employee or the state of
6 California based upon any failure to pay wages, pursuant to Labor Code § 2810.3

7 **GENERAL FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

8 10. Defendants are in the agricultural business and employ seasonal farm labor
9 employees to harvest agricultural goods. Plaintiff commenced employment with Defendants as a
10 non-exempt farm labor employee on a seasonal basis from approximately November, 2024 to
11 approximately February 2025 in the position of "Picker." Plaintiff's job duties involved
12 harvesting mandarin oranges. On the few paystubs Defendants' provided to Plaintiff, hours listed
13 improperly indicate that she worked up to 21 hours in a given day. However, Plaintiff generally
14 worked six days a week, 9:00 am– 4:00 pm, Monday through Saturday, although her time was
15 generally not recorded by Defendants.

16 11. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Plaintiff was paid exclusively on
17 a piece-rate basis, generally in cash, at a rate of \$55 per box.

18 12. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were generally not authorized to take
19 legally required meal periods because they were tasked with picking as many mandarins as
20 possible on any given shift. Despite Defendants' failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff and
21 other non-exempt employees to take all lawful meal periods, due to their uniform and unlawful
22 practices, Defendants never provided Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with an hour of
23 pay at their regular rate for each meal period violation as required by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon
24 information and belief, during at least a portion of the class period, Defendants maintained no
25 payroll code or another mechanism for the payment of meal period premiums in the event Plaintiff
26 and other non-exempt employees were not authorized to take lawful meal periods.

27 13. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were generally not authorized to take
28 legally required rest periods because they were tasked with picking as many mandarins as possible

on any given shift. Despite Defendants' failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees to take all lawful paid rest periods, due to their uniform and unlawful practices, Defendants never provided Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with an hour of pay at their regular rate for each rest period violation as required by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon information and belief, during at least a portion of the class period, Defendants maintained no payroll code or another mechanism for the payment of rest period premiums in the event Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not authorized to take lawful rest periods.

14. Defendants have failed to accurately record and compensate Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees who are compensated on a piece-rate basis for non-productive time. *See Gonzalez v. Downtown LA Motors, LP* (2013) 215 Cal.App.4th 36 (holding that a piece-rate compensation structure that does not separately compensate employees for non-productive time violates California minimum wage laws). Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were required to perform work duties and activities that were not directly compensated on a piece-rate basis, changing to different rows in same field, bathroom and water breaks, waiting for pickups, purchasing necessary equipment, calling in/receiving calls concerning schedules and pick up times, and/or other mandatory duties. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have not accurately tracked and compensated employees' non-productive time in compliance with Labor Code § 226.2.

15. Defendants have also failed to record employees' total hours worked each workday accurately. Specifically, Defendants' would pick up non-exempt employees and deliver non-exempt employees to the fields, but on information and belief, did not maintain records of the times that employees began and ended each workday. For example, Plaintiff's wage statement No. 217843, dated March 1, 2025, indicates that Plaintiff worked 21.8 hours and picked 12 boxes of fruit. This is for the entire week of February 17, 2025 to February 23, 2025. No other indicators of hours are provided. Similarly, Plaintiff's wage statement No. 218016, dated March 8, 2025, indicates that Plaintiff worked 1.9 hours and picked 1 box of fruit, with no other indicators of hours worked. Because Plaintiff was generally paid in cash, these are the only wage statements she has at the date of this filing. As a result of timekeeping failures, Defendants failed to ensure that Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were being paid at least the minimum wage for all

1 hours actually worked, failed to properly compensate for compensable non-productive time, and
2 failed to ensure that Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees received proper overtime wages
3 for all overtime hours worked, in compliance with Wage Order 14.

4 16. Defendants also never provided Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with a
5 first meal period when they worked shifts in excess of 5.0 hours. Instead, Plaintiff and other non-
6 exempt employees would have to eat while continuing to work, or skip meals altogether. Further,
7 on information and belief, Defendants failed to provide second meal periods when non-exempt
8 employees worked shifts in excess of 10.0 hours. Upon information and belief, Defendants'
9 forepersons did not generally provide meal periods. Despite Defendants' failure to provide
10 Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with all lawful meal periods due to their uniform and
11 unlawful practices, Defendants never provided Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with an
12 hour of pay at their regular rate for each meal period violation as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

13 17. Defendants failed to adequately reimburse Plaintiff for all reasonable and
14 necessary work expenditures, including but not limited to, requiring Plaintiff to purchase and
15 maintain shears, shoes, oil, and gloves for the harvesting of mandarins without reimbursement.

16 18. As a result of Defendants' failure to accurately compensate Plaintiff and other
17 non-exempt employees for non-productive time, failure to pay all minimum and overtime wages,
18 and failure to provide all required meal periods and authorize all rest periods or pay premium pay
19 in lieu thereof, Defendants have maintained inaccurate payroll records, failed to timely pay all
20 wages owed to separating employees at the time of their separation, and issued inaccurate wage
21 statements. Defendants' wage statement were further unlawful for failing to include the complete
22 address of the farm(s) being serviced by the non-exempt employees contracted to perform such
23 work by Ace Farm Labor Contracting, Inc.

24 19. Additionally, Ace Farm Labor Contracting, Inc. is a farm labor contractor subject
25 to the requirements of Labor Code § 205, which requires that employees be paid weekly, on a
26 business day designated in advance, for all wages earned up to and including the fourth day before
27 the scheduled payday. However, Defendants pay their employees on a delay of five days or more,
28 in violation of the "fourth day" requirement found in Labor Code § 205. (See ¶ 15, *supra*.)

1 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

2 20. **Class Definitions:** Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and the
3 following Classes pursuant to § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure:

4 a. The Minimum Wage Class consists of all current and former non-exempt
5 employees of Defendant Ace Farm Labor Contracting, Inc. in California who
6 performed work for Defendant Sun Pacific Farming Cooperative, Inc. that was
7 compensated on a piece-rate or hourly basis during the four years immediately
8 preceding the filing of this lawsuit through the present.

9 b. The Overtime Wage Class consists of all current and former non-exempt
10 employees of Defendant Ace Farm Labor Contracting, Inc. in California who
11 worked overtime hours (based on criteria set forth in Wage Order 14) while
12 performing work for Defendant Sun Pacific Farming Cooperative, Inc. during the
13 four years immediately preceding the filing of this lawsuit through the present.

14 c. The Meal Period Class consists of all current and former non-exempt employees
15 of Defendant Ace Farm Labor Contracting, Inc.. in California who: (i) worked at
16 least one shift in excess of 5.0 hours while performing work for Defendant Sun
17 Pacific Farming Cooperative, Inc. without a meal period of at least 30 minutes in
18 duration commencing prior to the conclusion of the fifth hour of work, and who
19 do not have a corresponding meal period premium payment made for such shifts
20 and/or (ii) worked at least one shift in excess of 10.0 hours while performing work
21 for Defendant Sun Pacific Farming Cooperative, Inc. without a second meal period
22 of at least 30 minutes in duration commencing prior to the conclusion of the tenth
23 hour of work, and who do not have a corresponding meal period premium payment
24 made for such shifts during the four years preceding the filing of this lawsuit
25 through the present.

26 d. The Rest Period Class consists of all current and former non-exempt employees of
27 Defendant Ace Farm Labor Contracting, Inc. in California who worked at least
28 one shift in excess of 3.5 hours without a rest period while performing work for

Defendant Sun Pacific Farming Cooperative, Inc. and who do not have a corresponding rest period premium payment during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this lawsuit through the present.

e. The Employee Expense Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-exempt employees in California who were not reimbursed for the purchase, use and maintenance of cell phones, tools and/or clothing and equipment necessary for the performance of their job duties during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this lawsuit to the present.

f. The Wage Statement Class consists of all members of the Minimum Wage Class, Overtime Class, Meal Period Class and/or Rest Period Class who received a wage statement from Defendants during the one year immediately preceding the filing of this lawsuit through the present.

g. The Waiting Time Class consists of all Defendants' formerly employed members of the Minimum Wage Class, Overtime Class, Meal Period Class and/or Rest Period Class who separated from employment during the three years immediately preceding the filing of this lawsuit through the present.

21. **Numerosity/Ascertainability:** The members of the Classes are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and not practicable. The membership of the Classes is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, it is estimated that the members of the Classes number greater than one hundred (100) individuals. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants' employment records.

22. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well Defined Community of Interest:** There are common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and all other similarly situated employees, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members. Those common questions include, without limitation:

i. Whether Defendants correctly compensated employees for rest periods pursuant to Labor Code § 226.2;

ii. Whether Defendants paid all minimum wages owed for all hours worked to

members of the Minimum Wage Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 118.2, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197;

- iii. Whether Defendants violated the applicable Labor Code provisions, including, but not limited to, §§ 510 and 1194 and Wage Order 14 by requiring members of the Overtime Wage Class to perform overtime work and not paying for said work in accordance with the overtime laws of the State of California;
- iv. Whether Defendants' timekeeping policies/practices resulted in the failure to properly compensate members of the Minimum Wage Class;
- v. Whether Defendants authorized and permitted legally compliant rest periods to members of the Rest Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;
- vi. Whether Defendants provided all legally compliant meal periods to members of the Meal Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;
- vii. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse members of the Employee Expense Class for business expenditures necessarily incurred in the performance of their duties;
- viii. Whether Defendants provided accurate, itemized wage statements to members of the Classes; and
- ix. Whether Defendants' policies and/or practices for the timing and amount of payment of final wages to members of the Waiting Time Class at the time of separation from employment were lawful.

23. **Predominance of Common Questions:** Common questions of law and fact predominate over questions that affect only individual members of the Classes. The common questions of law set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendants' policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member, such as Defendants' uniform piece-rate pay structure, meal and rest period policies and practices, timekeeping policies and practices, non-reimbursement, wage statement, and payment of final wages policies and practices. As such, the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual class member's showing as to his or her eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of his or her damages.

1 24. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Classes because
2 Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the
3 statute(s) of limitations period applicable to each cause of action pled in the Complaint. As alleged
4 herein, Plaintiff, like the members of the Classes, was paid on a piece-rate and hourly basis, was
5 subject to Defendants' meal and rest period and timekeeping policies and practices, was subjected
6 to Defendants' unlawful failure to reimburse business expenses, was furnished with inaccurate
7 and incomplete wage statements, and was not paid all wages earned at the time of her separation
8 of employment.

9 25. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary steps
10 to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the members of the Classes. Moreover,
11 Plaintiff's attorneys are ready, willing and able to fully and adequately represent the members of
12 the Classes and Plaintiff. Plaintiff's attorneys have prosecuted and defended numerous wage-
13 and-hour class actions in state and federal courts in the past and are committed to vigorously
14 prosecuting this action on behalf of the members of the Classes.

15 26. **Superiority:** The California Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves
16 an important public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in
17 California. These laws and labor standards protect the average working employee from
18 exploitation by employers who have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to
19 take advantage of superior economic and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and
20 conditions of employment. The nature of this action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff
21 and members of the Classes make the class action format a particularly efficient and appropriate
22 procedure to redress the violations alleged herein. If each employee were required to file an
23 individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily gain an unconscionable advantage since they
24 would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of each individual plaintiff with
25 their vastly superior financial and legal resources. Moreover, requiring each member of the
26 Classes to pursue an individual remedy would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by
27 employees who would be disinclined to file an action against their former and/or current employer
28 for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent damages to their careers at subsequent

1 employment. Further, the prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members, even
2 if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications
3 with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; and which would
4 establish potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or legal
5 determinations with respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be
6 dispositive of the interest of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which would
7 substantially impair or impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. Further,
8 the claims of the individual members of the Classes are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous
9 individual prosecution considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending thereto.
10 As such, the Classes (as defined herein) are maintainable as a Class under § 382 of the Code of
11 Civil Procedure.

12 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**

14 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

15 27. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

16 28. Wage Order 14, § 4 and California Labor Code §§ 1197 and 1182.12 establish the
17 right of employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked in amounts set by state law.
18 Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal
19 minimum wage as required by Labor Code § 1197 may recover the unpaid balance together with
20 attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid
21 wages and interest accrued thereon. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to conform
22 their pay practices to the requirements of the law by failing to pay Plaintiff and the Minimum
23 Wage Class for all hours actually worked including, but not limited to, all hours they were subject
24 to the control of Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the California Labor Code
25 and Wage Order 14.

26 29. California Labor Code § 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an employee
27 under conditions that the IWC prohibits. California Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide
28 that an employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage is liable to pay

1 those employees the balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages in an amount
2 equal to the wages due and interest thereon.

3 30. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged
4 herein, Plaintiff and the Minimum Wage Class have sustained economic damages, including but
5 not limited to, unpaid wages and lost interest in an amount to be established at trial, and they are
6 entitled to recover economic and statutory damages and penalties and other appropriate relief as
7 a result of Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code and Wage Order 14.

8 31. Defendants' practice and uniform administration of corporate policy regarding
9 illegal employee compensation is unlawful and creates an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and
10 members of the Minimum Wage Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of minimum wages,
11 liquidated damages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and attorneys' fees and costs
12 of suit according to California Labor Code §§ 204, 558, 1194, *et seq.*, 1197, 1198 and Code of
13 Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

14 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME WAGE**

16 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

17 32. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

18 33. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194,
19 and 1198, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to overtime wages for all
20 overtime hours worked, and provide a private right of action for the failure to pay all overtime
21 compensation for overtime work performed.

22 34. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly compensate
23 Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class for all overtime hours worked pursuant to California
24 Labor Code § 1194 and Wage Order 14. Wage Order 14, § 3 requires an employer to pay overtime
25 wages when an employee's hours worked cross certain thresholds or meet certain criteria set forth
26 in the Wage Order.

27 35. At all times relevant herein, Defendants caused Plaintiff and other non-exempt
28 employees to work overtime hours but did not compensate Plaintiff or members of the Overtime

1 Class at one and one-half times their regular rate of pay for such hours.

2 36. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and create entitlement to
3 recovery by Plaintiff and the Overtime Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of overtime
4 premiums owing, including interest thereon, statutory and civil penalties, and attorneys' fees and
5 costs of suit according to California Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198, Wage Order
6 14, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

7 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

9 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

10 37. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

11 38. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
12 failed in their affirmative obligation to provide all of their non-exempt employees in California,
13 including Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class, with all legally compliant meal periods
14 in accordance with the mandates of the California Labor Code and Wage Order 14, § 11. Despite
15 Defendants' violations, Defendants did not pay an additional hour of pay to Plaintiff and members
16 of the Meal Period Class at their respective regular rates of compensation, in accordance with
17 California Labor Code §§ 226.7, and 512.

18 39. As a result, Defendants are responsible for paying premium compensation for meal
19 period violations including interest thereon, as well as statutory penalties, civil penalties, and
20 costs of suit, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558, Wage Order 14, and Civil Code §§
21 3287(b) and 3289.

22 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

24 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

25 40. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

26 41. Wage Order 14, § 12 and California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516 establish the
27 right of employees to be authorized and permitted to take a paid rest period of at least ten (10)
28 minutes net rest time for each four (4) hour period worked, or major fraction thereof.

42. As alleged herein, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class to take all legally compliant rest periods.

43. The foregoing violations create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of rest period premiums owing, including interest thereon, as well as statutory penalties, civil penalties, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and Civil Code §§ 3287(b) and 3289.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

44. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

45. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code § 2802, which states that “an employer shall indemnify his or her employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer...”

46. Due to Defendants’ unlawful policy and practice of requiring employees to purchase and maintain tools necessary for the performance of their job duties and to incur mileage expense, Defendants have violated Labor Code § 2802.

47. Plaintiff and members of the Employee Expense Class are entitled to attorneys’ fees and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(c) for bringing this action.

48. Pursuant to Labor Code §2802(b), any action brought for the reimbursement of necessary expenditures carries interest at the same rate as judgments in civil actions. Thus, Plaintiff and members of the Employee Expense Class are entitled to interest, which shall accrue from the date on which they incurred the initial necessary expenditure.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

49. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

50. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants

1 knowingly and intentionally, as a matter of uniform practice and policy, failed to furnish Plaintiff
2 and the Wage Statement Class with accurate, itemized wage statements that included, among
3 other requirements, accurate total gross wages earned, meal and rest period premiums, sick pay
4 accruals, addresses of farms where work was performed, and total net wages earned in violation
5 of Labor Code §226 *et seq.*

6 51. Defendants' failure to furnish Plaintiff and the members of the Wage Statement
7 Class with complete and accurate, itemized wage statements resulted in actual injury, as said
8 failures led to, among other things, the non-payment of all of their meal and rest period
9 premiums, and deprived them of the information necessary to identify discrepancies in
10 Defendants' reported data.

11 52. Defendants' failures created an entitlement to Plaintiff and members of the Wage
12 Statement Class in a civil action for damages and/or penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226,
13 including statutory penalties civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs according to
14 suit pursuant to Labor Code § 226 *et seq.*

15 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**

17 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

18 53. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

19 54. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201-203, which require
20 an employer to pay all wages immediately at the time of termination of employment in the event
21 the employer discharges the employee or the employee provides at least 72 hours of notice of
22 his/her intent to quit. In the event the employee provides less than 72 hours of notice of his/her
23 intent to quit, said employee's wages become due and payable not later than 72 hours upon said
24 employee's last date of employment.

25 55. Defendants failed to timely pay Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Class
26 all final wages due to them at the time of their separation including, among other things, unpaid
27 amounts for rest and recovery periods and non-productive time, underpaid overtime and
28 minimum wages owed, and meal and rest period premium wages. Further, Plaintiff is informed

1 and believes, and based thereon alleges, that as a matter of uniform policy and practice,
2 Defendants continue to fail to pay members of the Waiting Time Class all earned wages at the
3 end of employment in a timely manner pursuant to the requirements of Labor Code §§ 201-203.
4 Defendants' failure to pay all final wages was willful within the meaning of Labor Code § 203.

5 56. Defendants' willful failure to timely pay Plaintiff and the members of the Waiting
6 Time Class their earned wages upon separation from employment results in a continued payment
7 of wages up to thirty (30) days from the time the wages were due. Therefore, Plaintiff and
8 members of the Waiting Time Class are entitled to compensation pursuant to Labor Code § 203,
9 plus reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

10 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

12 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

13 57. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

14 58. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful
15 business practices in California in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200
16 *et seq.*, by failing to pay Plaintiff and the Classes all overtime and minimum wages, provide all
17 required meal periods and failing to authorize and permit all required rest periods, failing to pay
18 meal and rest period premium wage payments, failing to reimburse for necessary business
19 expenditures, and failing to furnish accurate, itemized wage statements, and willfully failing to
20 timely pay Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Class all final wages upon separation of
21 employment.

22 59. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived
23 Plaintiff and continues to deprive members of the Classes of compensation to which they are
24 legally entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage
25 over Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers and
26 attempting to do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws.

27 60. Because Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged
28 herein, Plaintiff for herself and on behalf of the members of the Classes, seeks full restitution of

monies, as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17208.

61. The acts complained of herein occurred within the last four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint in this action.

62. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to protect her interests and those of the Classes, to obtain restitution and injunctive relief on behalf of Defendants' current non-exempt employees, and to enforce important rights affecting the public interest. Plaintiff has thereby incurred the financial burden of attorneys' fees and costs, which she is entitled to recover under Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR COMPETITION

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

63. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

64. Defendants have committed several Labor Code violations against Plaintiff, members of the Classes, and other aggrieved employees. Plaintiff, an "aggrieved employee" within the meaning of Labor Code § 2698 et seq., acting on behalf of herself and other aggrieved employees, brings this representative action against Defendants to recover the civil penalties due to Plaintiff, the members of the Classes, other aggrieved employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 558 and § 2699 (a) and (f) including, but not limited to: \$100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code § for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$250.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per employee per pay period; (4) \$250.00 for each initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; and/or (5) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for

1 which no civil penalty is specifically provided, based on the following Labor Code violations:

- 2 a. Failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked to Plaintiff, the Minimum
3 Wage Class, and other aggrieved employees in violation of Labor Code §§
4 551, 552, 558, 1182.12, 1184, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198;
- 5 b. Failing to pay Plaintiff, the Overtime Class, and other aggrieved employees all
6 earned overtime compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558,
7 1194, and 1198;
- 8 c. Failure to provide all legally required meal periods, and failure to pay meal
9 period premium wages, to Plaintiff, the Meal Period Class, and other aggrieved
10 employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§
11 226.7, 512, 1198;
- 12 d. Failing to authorize and permit all legally required rest periods, and failure to
13 pay rest period premium wages, to Plaintiff, the Rest Period Class, and other
14 aggrieved employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor
15 Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558;
- 16 e. Failing to reimburse Plaintiff, the Employee Expense Class and other
17 aggrieved employees for necessary business expenditures incurred by Plaintiff,
18 the Employee Expense Class and other aggrieved employees in violation of
19 Labor Code § 2802;
- 20 f. Failure to furnish Plaintiff, the Wage Statement Class, and other aggrieved
21 employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage statements in violation of
22 Labor Code § 226;
- 23 g. Failing to timely pay all final wages and compensation earned by Plaintiff, the
24 Waiting Time Class, and other aggrieved employees at the time of separation
25 in violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203;
- 26 h. Failing to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees all earned wages at least
27 twice during each calendar month in violation of Labor Code § 204;
- 28 i. Failing to permit and authorize Plaintiff and other non-exempt to exercise the
use of their accrued paid sick leave days in violation of Labor Code § 245.5,

246, and 248.5;

j. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1198;

k. Failing to provide legally mandated disclosures and/or written notices regarding the terms of employment of Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees in violation of Labor Code § 2810.5; and

l. Failing to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees weekly, on a business day designated in advance, for all wages earned up to and including the fourth day before the scheduled payday in violation of Labor Code § 205.

65. On February 24, 2026, Plaintiff notified the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) via its website, and also notified Defendants via certified mail, of Defendants’ violations of the California Labor Code and Plaintiff’s intent to bring a claim for civil penalties under California Labor Code § 2698 et seq. with respect to violations of the California Labor Code identified in Paragraph 64 (a)-(l). Now that sixty-five days have passed from Plaintiff’s notifying Defendants and the LWDA of these violations, and the LWDA has not provided that it intends to investigate the violations, Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act with respect to these violations.

66. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to protect her interests and the interests of other similarly aggrieved employees, and to assess and collect the civil penalties owed by Defendants. Plaintiff has thereby incurred attorneys’ fees and costs, which she is entitled to receive under California Labor Code § 2699(g).

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for herself and for all others on whose behalf this suit is brought against Defendants, as follows:

1. For an order certifying the proposed Classes;
2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the Classes;
3. For an order appointing Counsel for Plaintiff as Counsel for the Classes;

1 4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for payment of minimum wages, liquidated
2 damages, and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, and
3 1197;

4 5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general, and
5 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;

6 6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and
7 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558;

8 7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and
9 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558;

10 8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general, and
11 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 2802;

12 9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code §
13 226, *et seq.*;

14 10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for statutory waiting time penalties pursuant
15 to Labor Code § 201-203;

16 11. Upon the Eighth Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiff and members of the
17 Classes of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or
18 practices declared by this Court to be in violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et*
19 *seq.*;

20 12. Upon the Ninth Cause of Action, for (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each
21 failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional
22 violation pursuant to Labor Code § 210 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the
23 amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent
24 violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee pay period; (3) \$100.00 for each initial
25 violation and \$250.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per
26 employee pay period, (4) \$250.00 for each initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each subsequent
27 violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; and/or (5) \$100.00 for
28 each initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for the

violations of the Labor Code sections cited in Labor Code § 2699.5;

13. Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to California Labor Code § 218.6 and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289;

14. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and all other applicable statutes; and

15. For such other and further relief the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: May 28, 2026
Respectfully submitted,
STANBURY BROWN LAW

By: 
Daniel J. Brown
Attorneys for Plaintiff

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial with respect to all issues triable by jury.

Dated: May 28, 2026
Respectfully submitted,
STANBURY BROWN LAW

By: 
Daniel J. Brown
Attorneys for Plaintiff

1
2 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

3 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
4 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) ss.

5 I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of
6 18 years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 2610 ½ Abbot Kinney
7 Blvd. Venice, CA 90291

8 On May 28, 2026, I served the document listed below on the parties in this action as follows:

9 - **FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**

10 ☐ (BY MAIL) I placed such envelope on the above date, with postage fully prepaid, for
11 deposit in the U.S. Postal Service at my place of business at Venice, California,
12 following the ordinary business practices of my place of business. I am readily familiar
13 with the business practice at my place of business for collection and processing of
14 correspondence for mail with the U.S. Postal Service. Under that practice, such
15 correspondence is deposited with the U.S. Postal Service the same day it is collected
16 and processed in the ordinary course of business.

17 ☒ (BY EMAIL or ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION) By electronically transmitting the
18 document(s) listed above to the email address(es) of the person(s) set forth on the
19 attached service list from the email address assistant@stansburybrownlaw.com. I did
20 not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or
21 other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful. Service by e-mail was made
22 pursuant to agreement of the parties, confirmed in writing, or as an additional method
23 of service as a courtesy to the parties or pursuant to Court Order. See Cal. R. Ct. R.
24 2.260.

25 ☒ (STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California
26 that the above is true and correct.

27 Executed on May 28, 2026, at Ventura, CA.

28 Isabella C. Aguinaga

Isabella Aguinaga

SERVICE LIST

I. Ace Farm Labor Contracting, Inc.
Gerardo Hernandez, Esq.
Carolyn Hudson, Esq.
Aaron Bausch, Esq.
Erendira Herrera
Naomi Herrera
Monica King
Littler Mendelson P.C.
5200 North Palm Avenue. Suite 302
Fresno, CA 93704
mking@littler.com
nherrera@littler.com
eherrera@littler.com
abausch@littler.com
chudson@littler.com
ghernandez@littler.com

Attorneys for Ace Farm Labor Contracting, Inc.

II. Barsamian & Moodey
Catherine Houlihan , Esq.
Patrick S. Moody, Esq.
11 W. Sha. #104
Fresno, CA. 93711
choulihan@theemployerslawfirm.com
pmoody@theemployerslawfirm.com
laborlaw@theemployerslawfirm.com

Attorneys for Defendant Sun Pacific Farming Cooperative, Inc.