

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)
Alexander J. Curry, Esq. (SBN 346207)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
jklein@lelawfirm.com
acurry@lelawfirm.com

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
4/17/2026 11:06 AM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By E. Galicia, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff ELIZABETH HERNANDEZ LOPEZ,
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

ELIZABETH HERNANDEZ LOPEZ, on behalf
of herself and current and former aggrieved
employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

PENNEY OPCO LLC; JCPENNEY; and DOES 1
to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **26STCV12432**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF ELIZABETH
HERNANDEZ LOPEZ'S
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff ELIZABETH HERNANDEZ LOPEZ ("Plaintiff"), who alleges
and complains against Defendants PENNEY OPCO LLC; JCPENNEY; and DOES 1 to 100,
inclusive (collectively "Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*
("PAGA") representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California, herself
and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-exempt
employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated with

Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all hours worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure to pay overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant meal periods or pay meal period premium wages; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or pay rest period premium wages; statutory penalties for failure to timely produce requested employment records; indemnification for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by employees in direct consequence of discharging their duties; statutory penalties for failure to provide accurate wage statements; statutory waiting time penalties in the form of continuation wages for failure to timely pay employees all wages due upon separation of employment. Plaintiff experienced these violations personally, as well as is informed and believes other aggrieved employees did as well. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of thirty-five thousand dollars (\$35,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout California, including but not limited to Los Angeles County, at 1131 W Rancho Vista Blvd., Palmdale, CA 93551.

III. PARTIES

3. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency on behalf of himself and other current and former employees subject to violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is

1 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work
2 for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
3 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently
4 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by
5 Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Los Angeles from in or around October
6 22, 2024 until on or about October 24, 2025.

7 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant PENNEY
8 OPCO LLC is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business in the
9 State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-25 are, and at all times relevant hereto were
10 persons acting on behalf of Defendant PENNEY OPCO LLC in the establishment of, or ratification
11 of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant PENNEY OPCO LLC
12 operates in Los Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Los Angeles
13 County, including but not limited to, at 1131 W Rancho Vista Blvd., Palmdale, CA 93551.

14 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant JCPENNEY is
15 authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business in the State of
16 California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-25 are, and at all times relevant hereto were persons
17 acting on behalf of Defendant JCPENNEY in the establishment of, or ratification of, the
18 aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant JCPENNEY operates in Los
19 Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County, including
20 but not limited to, at 1131 W Rancho Vista Blvd., Palmdale, CA 93551.

21 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 1
22 through 50 are corporations, or are other business entities or organizations of a nature unknown to
23 Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California non-exempt employees, permitted
24 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised control over the wages, hours and working
25 conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

26 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 51
27 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each of the individual defendants is sued
28 individually and in his or her capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner, representative, manager,

supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant who violated or caused to be violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor Code and/or any provision of the Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

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

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

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

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

(Against all Defendants by Plaintiff on behalf of Themselves, the State of California, and Other Current and Former Aggrieved Employees)

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

11. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1198.5, 2802, 6401.7, 6401.9, and the applicable Wage Orders.

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

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

indirectly, performing services which inure to the benefit of the employer.

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

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

(a) Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees were sometimes interrupted by customers traveling to the clock-in machine prior to being permitted to clock-in for their start shift.

16. Therefore, Defendants suffered, permitted, and required Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to be subject to Defendants’ control without paying wages for that time. This resulted in Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees working time for which they were not compensated any wages, in violation of Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 and the applicable Wage Order.

17. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer’s conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

18. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay and/or failure to pay overtime wages at the proper rate of pay:** Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt employees. In California, an employer is required to pay hourly employees for all “hours worked,” which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered and permitted to work. This

1 includes the time an employee spends, either directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to
2 the benefit of the employer.’

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

6 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40) hours
7 in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in
8 any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-one-half
9 (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve (12) hours
10 in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay
11 for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a
12 workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an
13 employee.

14 Labor Code section 510.

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

18 (a) Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
19 exempt employees were sometimes interrupted by customers traveling to the clock-in machine prior
20 to being permitted to clock-in for their start shift.

21 21. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
22 Employer’s conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
23 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
24 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

25 22. Furthermore, overtime is based upon an employee’s regular rate of pay. “The regular
26 rate at which an employee is employed shall be deemed to include all remuneration for employment
27 paid to, or on behalf, of the employee.” *See* Division of Labor Standards Enforcement –
28 Enforcement Policies and Interpretations Manual, Section 49.1.2.

29 23. In this case, Plaintiff alleges that when she and other current and former aggrieved
30 California-based hourly non-exempt employees earned overtime wages, Defendants failed to pay
31 them overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay due to Defendants’ failure to include all

1 remuneration when calculating the overtime rate of pay. Specifically, Defendants maintained a
2 policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as “commissions”,
3 example, when calculating Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based
4 hourly non-exempt employees’ regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying overtime.

5 24. The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each
6 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
7 employees were under the control of Defendants but were not compensated. To the extent that the
8 foregoing uncompensated time occurred when Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
9 California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday,
10 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendants failed
11 to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code
12 sections 510, 1194 and 1198, and the applicable Wage Order.

13 25. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
14 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant meal periods and/or failure to**
15 **pay period premium wages:** Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
16 hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked shifts of more than five (5) hours in length and
17 shifts of more than ten (10) hours in length.

18 26. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an
19 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of
20 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee’s activities prior to the
21 employee’s sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 7 at §11;
22 *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ
23 an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee
24 with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh
25 hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period
26 shall be considered an “on duty” meal period and counted as time worked. A paid “on duty” meal
27 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved
28 of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

1 27. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
2 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay
3 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
4 sections 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 7 at §11.

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

9 (a) Sometimes failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
10 California-based hourly non-exempt employees timely, uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at
11 least 30 minutes for every five hours worked, due to lack of coverage.

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

17 30. Finally, on occasions when Defendants paid Plaintiff and other current and former
18 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a "premium" wage for late, missed, short,
19 on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted meal periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1) additional
20 hour of pay at Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
21 exempt employees' regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy,
22 practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as "commissions", for
23 example, when calculating Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based
24 hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying meal period premium
25 wages.

26 31. Defendants' foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff and
27 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not receiving
28 wages to compensate them for workdays during which Defendants did not provide them with meal

1 periods in compliance with California law.

2 32. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
3 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
4 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
5 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

6 33. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
7 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant rest periods and/or failure to pay**
8 **rest period premium:** Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
9 non-exempt employees regularly worked shifts of more than three-and-a-half (3.5) hours.

10 34. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
11 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor Code
12 section 226.7; Wage Order 7 at §12. Under California law, "[e]mployees are entitled to 10 minutes'
13 rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six
14 hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on." *Brinker*
15 *Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code section 226.7;
16 Wage Order 7 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each work period.
17 Wage Order 7 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement "“obligates employers to permit –
18 and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*
19 (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all
20 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

21 35. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer must
22 pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday the
23 employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7; Wage
24 Order 7 at § 12.

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

1 (a) Sometimes failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
2 California-based hourly non-exempt employees with a net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four
3 (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof, due to lack of coverage.

4 37. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
5 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
6 hourly non-exempt employees with one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday
7 they did not receive legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor Code section
8 226.7.

9 38. Finally, on occasions when Defendants did pay Plaintiff and other current and former
10 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a “premium” wage for late, missed, short,
11 on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted rest periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1) additional
12 hour of pay at Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
13 exempt employees’ regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy,
14 practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such “commissions”, for example,
15 when calculating Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
16 exempt employees’ regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying rest period premiums.

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

21 40. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
22 Employer’s conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
23 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
24 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

25 41. **Failure to produce requested employment records:** An employer must afford
26 current and former employees the right to inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to their
27 employment, upon reasonable request to the employer. Labor Code section 226(b). An employer
28 who receives a request to inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to a current or former

1 employee must comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than twenty-one (21)
2 calendar days from the date of the request. Labor Code section 226(c). Additionally, every current
3 and former employee, or his or her representative, has the right to inspect and receive a copy of the
4 personnel records that the employer maintains relating to the employee's performance or to any
5 grievance concerning the employee. Labor Code section 1198.5(a). Upon written request from a
6 current or former employee or his or her representative, an employer must make the contents of
7 those personnel records available for inspection or provide a copy of the personnel records to the
8 current or former employee, or his or her representative, not later than thirty (30) calendar days from
9 the date the employer receives the written request, subject to some limited exceptions. Labor Code
10 §1198.5(b)(1). Failure to comply with these requests allows for a civil penalty seven hundred fifty
11 dollars (\$750), pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198.5(k) and 226(f).

12 42. On December 11, 2025, Plaintiff sent a written request through her counsel to
13 Defendants for her payroll records, timecards, and personnel records pursuant to Labor Code
14 sections 226 and 1198.5. However, Defendants failed to timely produce the requested employment
15 records, in violation of Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Defendants have not produced any of
16 the requested employment records as of the date of this Complaint.

17 43. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that other similarly situated
18 employees also sent written requests for their employment records, but Defendants failed to timely
19 produce the required and requested records, in violation of Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5.

20 44. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
21 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
22 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

23 45. **Failure to Indemnify for Losses and Expenditures Incurred as Part of**
24 **Employment:** California law requires that every employer must indemnify its employees for all
25 necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in discharge of his or her duties or at the
26 obedience of the directions of the employer. Moreover, an employer is prohibited from passing the
27 ordinary business expenses and losses of the employer onto the employee. (Lab. Code, § 2802.)

28 46. Defendants have violated Labor Code Section 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiff

1 and other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees' necessary
2 expenditures they incurred in the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendants employed
3 policies, practices, and/or procedures included, but not limited to:

4 (a) Sometimes requiring Employee and other current and former California-based
5 employees the use of their personal cell phone (including both telephone use and cellular data use)
6 for work-related purposes - without reimbursing Employee and other current and former California-
7 based employees for such use.

8 (b) Requiring Employee and other current and former California-based employees to
9 purchase items to be formally uniformed for work- related purposes.

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

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

17 49. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
18 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
19 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
20 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

1 section 204(d).

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

9 52. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
10 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
11 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

12 53. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
13 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
14 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
15 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by
16 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful
17 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,
18 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor
19 Code section 1198, the Defendant secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while
20 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

21 54. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
22 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
23 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

24 55. **Failure to Establish, Implement, and Maintain a Workplace Violence and**
25 **Injury Prevention Program in Compliance with Labor Code Sections 6401.7 and 6401.9:**
26 California Labor Code Section 6401.7 requires every employer to establish, implement, and
27 maintain an effective injury prevention program. California Labor Code Section 6401.9 requires
28 California employers to adopt a comprehensive Workplace Violence Prevention Plan (WVPP), train

1 employees on workplace violence, log safety incidents, and conduct periodic inspections to evaluate
2 workplace violence hazards.

3 Plaintiff alleges that Defendant did not comply with Defendant's responsibilities and duties
4 under Labor Code sections 6401.7 and 6401.9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges
5 that Defendant (1) failed to establish, implement, and maintain an effective injury prevention
6 program; (2) failed to adopt a compliant Workplace Violence Prevention Plan; (3); failed to train
7 Employee and other aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees in workplace
8 violence and injury prevention; (4) failed to log safety incidents; and (5) failed to conduct compliant
9 periodic inspections. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional. Plaintiff also
10 believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendant would further be liable
11 for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

25 57. As a derivative of Plaintiff's allegations above, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff
26 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
27 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period
28 premium wages) rendered Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based

hourly non-exempt employees' wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

58. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

59. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

60. **Failure to pay employees all wages due at time of termination/resignation:** An employer is required to pay all unpaid wages timely after an employee's employment ends. The wages are due immediately upon termination (Labor Code section 201) or within seventy-two (72) hours of resignation (Labor Code section 202).

61. As a derivative of Plaintiff's allegations above, because Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all their earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period premium wages), Defendants failed to pay those employees timely after each employee's termination and/or resignation, in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

62. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

63. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

64. Labor Code sections 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees, to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties against all Defendants pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

65. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code section 2699.3. On February 10, 2026, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the violations alleged.

1 66. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by
2 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code
3 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the
4 parties notice within 60 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends
5 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

6 67. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
7 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7,
8 246, 510, 512, 1194, 6401.7 and 6401.9: During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the
9 present, preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in
10 the following amounts:

11 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, 1198, and
12 2802; one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation
13 and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent
14 violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

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

19 c. For violations of Labor Code section 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50) for each
20 employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, one
21 hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts
22 established by Labor Code section 558].

23 d. For violations of Labor Code section 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for
24 each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, or any
25 willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee,
26 plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code
27 section 210].

28 e. For violations of Labor Code section 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for

1 each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, or any
2 willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee,
3 plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code
4 section 225.5].

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

7 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

8 **WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HERSELF AND ON OTHER AGGRIEVED**
9 **EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:**

10 **ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:**

11 1. That Defendants be found to have violated the provisions of the Labor Code and the
12 IWC Wages Orders as to the Plaintiff and aggrieved employees;

13 2. For any and all legally applicable penalties during the relevant statute of limitations
14 subject to any permissible tolling, including but not limited to those recoverable under the California
15 Labor Code, including but not limited to sections 210, 225.5, 226.3, 558, 2699(f);

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

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

20
21 Dated: April 17, 2026

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

22
23 By: /s/ Alexander J. Curry
24 Joseph Lavi, Esq.
25 Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
26 Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.
27 Alexander Curry, Esq.
28 Attorneys for Plaintiff
ELIZABETH HERNANDEZ LOPEZ,
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved
employees