

1 Ronald H. Bae (SBN 186826)
rbac@AequitasLegalGroup.com
2 Olivia D. Scharrer (SBN 291470)
oscharrer@AequitasLegalGroup.com
3 Carson M. Turner (SBN 345992)
cturner@AequitasLegalGroup.com
4 AEQUITAS LEGAL GROUP
A Professional Law Corporation
5 1156 E. Green Street, Suite 200
Pasadena, California 91106
6 Telephone: (213) 674-6080
Facsimile: (213) 674-6081
7

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff GLORIA MORALES

9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

10 **COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**

11
12 GLORIA MORALES, individually, and on
13 behalf of other members of the general public
14 similarly situated and other aggrieved
employees,

15 Plaintiff,

16 vs.

17 EASTGATE PETROLEUM, LLC, a Nevada
18 limited liability company; and DOES 1
through 100, inclusive,

19 Defendants.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No. C26-00215

[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon.
Benjamin T. Reyes II, Dept. 16]

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT AND ENFORCEMENT
ACTION UNDER THE PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT,
CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 2698, ET
SEQ.**

- (1) Violation of California Labor Code §§
510, 1194, and 1198 (Failure to Pay
Minimum and Overtime Wages);
- (2) Violation of California Labor Code §§
226.7 and 512(a) (Failure to Provide
Compliant Meal Periods or Pay
Premium Wage in Lieu Thereof);
- (3) Violation of California Labor Code §
226.7 (Failure to Provide Compliant
Rest Periods or Pay Premium Wage in
Lieu Thereof);
- (4) Violation of California Labor Code §§
201 – 203 (Failure to Pay Wages Timely
Upon Termination);

- (5) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business-Related Expenses);
- (6) Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) (Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements);
- (7) Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and
- (8) Penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* (Private Attorneys General Act) and California Labor Code § 558.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff GLORIA MORALES, individually and on behalf of all other members of the public similarly situated and other aggrieved employees, alleges as follows:

NATURE OF ACTION

1. This wage-and-hour class action and representative enforcement action is brought by Plaintiff GLORIA MORALES, on her own behalf and on behalf of all other members of the public similarly situated, the State of California, and all other aggrieved employees, against a California employer known as EASTGATE PETROLEUM, LLC and other related entities and individuals (if any).

2. The California Supreme Court has expressly stated that the State of California “has a public policy which encourages the use of the class action device.” It explained that “[b]y establishing a technique whereby the claims of many individuals can be resolved at the same time, the class suit both eliminates the possibility of repetitious litigation and provides small claimants with a method of obtaining redress for claims which would otherwise be too small to warrant individual litigation.” The high court further stated that “California's overtime laws are remedial and are to be construed so as to promote employee protection.”

3. Plaintiff and the proposed class will seek to certify the appropriate class(es) and subclass(es) and then adjudicate and obtain all available relief on behalf of the certified class(es)

1 and subclass(es) for the alleged systematic and class-wide violations of California Labor Code set
2 forth below and all other applicable laws discussed herein.

3 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4 4. This class action is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382.
5 The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits
6 of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial. The amount in
7 controversy for each class representative, including claims for compensatory damages and pro rata
8 share of attorneys' fees, is less than \$75,000.

9 5. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution,
10 Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all causes except
11 those given by statute to other courts." The statutes under which this action is brought do not
12 specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

13 6. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and
14 belief, each party is either a citizen of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or
15 otherwise intentionally avails itself of the California market so as to render the exercise of
16 jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and
17 substantial justice.

18 7. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, one or more of
19 the named Defendants reside, transact business, or have offices in this county and the acts and
20 omissions alleged herein took place in this county.

21 8. Plaintiff has timely provided notice to the California Labor and Workforce
22 Development Agency ("LWDA") and to Defendants, pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3.

23 **THE PARTIES**

24 9. Plaintiff GLORIA MORALES (hereinafter "Plaintiff") is at least 18 years of age
25 and is a resident of the County of Contra Costa in the State of California.

26 10. Defendant EASTGATE PETROLEUM, LLC was and is, upon information and
27 belief, a Nevada limited liability company, and at all times hereinafter mentioned, an employer
28 whose employees are engaged throughout this county and in the State of California.

11. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names or capacities of defendants sued herein under the fictitious names DOES 1 through 100, but prays for leave to amend and serve such fictitiously named defendants pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 474 once their names and capacities become known.

12. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DOES 1 through 100 are the partners, agents, joint venturers, owners, shareholders, managers or employees of EASTGATE PETROLEUM, LLC and were acting on behalf of EASTGATE PETROLEUM, LLC at all relevant times.

13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and all of the acts and omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to EASTGATE PETROLEUM, LLC and DOES 1 through 100 (hereinafter, collectively “Defendants”), each acting as an agent or alter ego for the other and/or as a joint venturer, or working in concert with, each of Defendants acting within the course and scope of such agency, joint venture, or concerted activity, with legal authority to act on the other’s behalf. The acts of any and all Defendants were in accordance with and represent the official policy of Defendants.

14. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, ratified each and every act or omission complained of herein. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of each and all the other Defendants in proximately causing the damages herein alleged.

15. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said Defendants is in some manner intentionally, negligently, or otherwise responsible for the acts, omissions, occurrences, and transactions alleged herein.

16. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said Defendants is in some manner intentionally, negligently, or otherwise responsible for the acts, omissions, occurrences, and transactions alleged herein.

17. Furthermore, Defendants are jointly and severally liable as employers for all violations alleged herein because they have each exercised sufficient control over the wages, hours, and working conditions of Plaintiff and all other persons similarly situated. Each Defendant

1 had the power to hire and fire Plaintiff, set policies governing the employment, controlled and
2 supervised the working conditions, determined and controlled the compensation, and maintained
3 the employment records. As joint employers of Plaintiff and all other persons similarly situated,
4 Defendants are joint and severally liable for all available relief under California law.

5 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

6 18. Plaintiff brings this action on her own behalf, as well as on behalf of each and all
7 other persons similarly situated and seeks class certification under California Code of Civil
8 Procedure § 382.

9 19. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief
10 authorized by California law.

11 20. Plaintiff's proposed class and subclass consist of and are defined as follows:

12 Unpaid Wage Class: All current and former non-exempt, hourly-paid
13 employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California at any
14 time between 4 years prior to the filing of this complaint and the date of
15 final judgment in this action, who were not paid for all hours worked at
16 the appropriate rate of pay.

17 Regular Rate Miscalculation Subclass: All current and former
18 non-exempt, hourly-paid employees who worked for Defendants
19 in the State of California at any time between 4 years prior to the
20 filing of this complaint and the date of final judgment in this
21 action, who worked a night shift and a received a night shift
22 differential but did not receive the correct overtime rate of pay
23 due to Defendants' miscalculation of the regular rate of pay.

24 On-Duty Meal Period Subclass: All current and former non-
25 exempt, hourly-paid employees who worked for Defendants in
26 the State of California at any time between 4 years prior to the
27 filing of this complaint and the date of final judgment in this
28 action, who were required to suffer an on-duty meal period.

Phone Meeting Subclass: All current and former non-exempt,
hourly-paid employees who worked for Defendants in the State of
California at any time between 4 years prior to the filing of this
complaint and the date of final judgment in this action, who were
required to participate in phone meetings on their days off.

On-Call Subclass: All current and former non-exempt, hourly-
paid employees who worked for Defendants in the State of
California at any time between 4 years prior to the filing of this
complaint and the date of final judgment in this action, who were
required to be on-call but were not compensated.

1 Post-Shift Work Subclass: All current and former non-exempt,
2 hourly-paid employees who worked for Defendants in the State of
3 California at any time between 4 years prior to the filing of this
complaint and the date of final judgment in this action, who
worked after punching out at the end of their shift and were not
compensated for those hours worked.

4 Time Punch Edit Subclass: All current and former non-exempt,
5 hourly-paid employees who worked for Defendants in the State of
6 California at any time between 4 years prior to the filing of this
7 complaint and the date of final judgment in this action, whose
time punch entries were altered by Defendants' supervisors so as
to cause underpayment of hours worked.

8 Tip Jar Subclass: All current and former non-exempt, hourly-paid
9 employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California
10 at any time between 4 years prior to the filing of this complaint
and the date of final judgment in this action, who had customer-
facing jobs but never received any portion of the tips in jars that
are placed by the cash register.

11 Off-the-Clock Meal Period Subclass: All current and former non-
12 exempt, hourly-paid employees who worked for Defendants in
the State of California at any time between 4 years prior to the
13 filing of this complaint and the date of final judgment in this
action, who worked during their meal periods and were not
14 compensated for those hours worked.

15 Off-the-Clock Rest Period Subclass: All current and former non-
16 exempt, hourly-paid employees who worked for Defendants in
the State of California at any time between 4 years prior to the
17 filing of this complaint and the date of final judgment in this
action, who worked during their rest periods and were not
compensated for those hours worked.

18 Meal Period Class

19 All current and former non-exempt, hourly-paid employees who worked
20 for Defendants in the State of California at any time between 4 years
prior to the filing of this complaint and the date of final judgment in this
21 action, who worked one or more shifts longer than 5 hours and suffered
non-compliant meal periods but did not receive premium wages.

22 Rest Period Class

23 All current and former non-exempt, hourly-paid employees who worked
24 for Defendants in the State of California at any time between 4 years
prior to the filing of this complaint and the date of final judgment in this
action, who worked one or more shifts of 3.5 hours or longer and
suffered non-compliant rest periods but did not receive premium wages.

25 Waiting Time Penalty Class

26 All current and former non-exempt, hourly-paid employees who worked
27 for Defendants in the State of California at any time between 3 years
prior to the filing of this complaint and the date of final judgment in this
28 action, who were not timely paid all their wages due at the time of
termination.

Business Expenses Class

All current and former non-exempt, hourly-paid employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California at any time between 4 years prior to the filing of this complaint and the date of final judgment in this action, who incurred necessary expenditures to purchase equipment and/or supplies to perform their job.

Wage Statement Class

All current and former non-exempt, hourly-paid employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California at any time between 3 years prior to the filing of this complaint and the date of final judgment in this action, who received inaccurate wage statements.

UCL Class

All non-exempt, hourly-paid employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California at any time between 4 years prior to the filing of this complaint and the date of final judgment in this action, who have been harmed by Defendant's unlawful/unfair business practices and/or suffered Labor Code violations.

21. Plaintiff reserves the right to redefine and/or establish additional classes and subclasses after conducting discovery.

22. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation, and the class and subclass are readily ascertainable:

(a) Numerosity: The members of the class and each subclass are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical. The membership of the entire class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time. However, the class is estimated to be greater than fifty (50) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment records.

(b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each class member with whom he has a well-defined community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) are typical of all class members' as demonstrated herein.

(c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately, protect the interests of each class member with whom he has a well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein.

Plaintiff acknowledges that he has an obligation to make known to the Court

any relationship, conflicts or differences with any class member. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are well-versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff and her counsel have incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

- (d) Superiority: The nature of this action makes the use of class action adjudication superior to other methods. A class action will achieve economies of time, effort and expense as compared with separate lawsuits and will avoid inconsistent outcomes because the same issues can be adjudicated in the same manner and at the same time for the entire class.
- (e) Public Policy Considerations: Unfortunately, many employers in the State of California violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are fearful of bringing actions because they believe their former employers might damage their future endeavors through negative references and/or other means. Class actions provide the class members who are not named in the complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights at the same time as their privacy is protected.

23. There are common questions of law and fact as to the class and each subclass that predominate over questions affecting only individual members, including but not limited to:

- (a) Whether Defendants miscalculated the regular rate of pay for Plaintiff and similarly situated employees;
- (b) Whether the on-duty meal period agreement was legally valid;
- (c) Whether Defendants compensated Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for the time had to attend phone meeting on their days off;

- (d) Whether Defendants compensated Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for being on-call;
- (e) Whether Defendants compensated Plaintiff and similar situated employees for the hours worked after they clocked out at the end of their shifts;
- (f) Whether Defendants and their supervisor manually edited the time entries to cause underpayment of all hours worked;
- (g) Whether Plaintiff and similar situated employees were compensated for the work performed during the non-compliant meal periods;
- (h) Whether Plaintiff and similar situated employees were compensated for the work performed during the non-compliant rest periods;
- (i) Whether Defendants provided Plaintiff and similarly situated employees with timely, uninterrupted, duty-free, 30-minute meal periods within the first 5 hours of work, and/or provided second timely, uninterrupted, duty-free, 30-minute meal periods on shifts longer than 10 hours, and whether Defendants paid the required premiums when such compliant meal periods were not provided, as required by California law;
- (j) Whether Defendants paid Plaintiff and similarly situated employees the tips left by the customers;
- (k) Whether Defendants provided Plaintiff and similarly situated employees with timely, uninterrupted, and net 10-minute rest periods for every 4 hours worked or major fraction thereof, and whether Defendants paid the required premiums when such compliant rest periods were not provided, as required by California law;
- (l) Whether Defendants paid Plaintiff and similarly situated employees all wages owed upon the separation of their employment within the time periods required by California law
- (m) Whether Defendants reimbursed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for all necessary business-related expenses;

- (n) Whether Defendants provided accurate, itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees, as required by California law;
- (o) Whether Defendants' conduct, as described above, was willful or reckless;
- (p) Whether Defendants engaged in unfair and/or unlawful business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and
- (q) The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, or monetary penalties resulting from Defendants' violations of California law.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

24. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other persons as non-exempt employees who belong to the class and subclass as set forth above.

25. Defendants employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee from approximately January 2024 to March 2025. Plaintiff worked as a Cashier, but her job duties included numerous other tasks such as sweeping the parking lot, picking up trash, doing landscaping work, and going to other stores owned and operated by Defendants.

Unpaid Minimum and Overtime Wages

26. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants systematically failed to pay minimum and overtime wages to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees.

27. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees worked night shifts for which they received night shift differential pay which is higher than their respective hourly wage. Defendants, however, did not factor in the night shift differential in calculating the regular rate of pay, thereby causing the underpayment of overtime pay. In addition, Defendants required Plaintiff and similarly situated employees to be subject to an on-duty meal period agreement, even though the nature of the work does not prevent Plaintiff and similarly situated employees from being relieved of all duties and responsibilities during their meal periods. On their days off, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were required to participate in company phone meetings using their own personal phones but were never compensated for such hours worked. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were required to be on-call but were never compensated for being on-call.

28. Moreover, Plaintiff and similar situated employees were required to clock out but

1 then had to keep working for which time they were uncompensated. On some occasions,
2 Plaintiff's manager changed Plaintiff's time punch detail to reflect that Plaintiff took a meal period
3 even though Plaintiff did not. Furthermore, Defendants had a tip jar placed at the counter near the
4 cash register where customers regularly put in cash for tips, but Plaintiff and similarly situated
5 employees never received any portion of those tips.

6 29. Plaintiff's and similarly situated employees' uncompensated hours worked include
7 regular and overtime hours.

8 Non-Compliant Meal Periods

9 30. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide compliant meal
10 periods to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees, as required by California law. Plaintiff and
11 similarly situated employees were deprived of the opportunity to take a timely, duty-free,
12 uninterrupted meal period of at least 30 minutes for every 5 hours of work on account of: (a)
13 Defendants' intentional understaffing of employees per each shift such that the workers had no
14 choice but to forego or cut short their statutorily-guaranteed 30-minute meal periods in order to
15 meet production quotas and/or Defendants' production expectations; (b) Defendants' failure to
16 schedule meal periods at a certain time, and even if a specific meal period start and end times were
17 specified or mandated, Defendants failed to enforce it such that the meal period would start late,
18 be cut short, be interrupted, or otherwise be non-compliant; and (c) Defendants' intentional and
19 systematic overloading of work on Plaintiff and other employees such that they were unable to
20 complete their assigned work or meet Defendants' and/or customers' expectations and demands
21 unless Plaintiff and other employees cut their meal periods short and/or take late meal periods.
22 Defendants did not pay meal period premiums to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees when
23 compliant meal periods were not provided.

24 Non-Compliant Rest Periods

25 31. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide compliant rest
26 periods to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees, as required by California law. Plaintiff and
27 similarly situated employees were deprived of the opportunity to take a timely, duty-free,
28 uninterrupted rest period of at least net 10 minutes for each 4 hours of work or major fraction

1 thereof on account of: (a) Defendants' intentional understaffing of employees per each shift such
2 that the workers had no choice but to forego or cut short their statutorily-guaranteed net 10-minute
3 uninterrupted rest periods in order to meet production quotas and/or Defendants' production
4 expectations; (b) Defendants' failure to schedule rest periods at a certain time and even if a
5 specific rest period start and end times were specified or mandated, Defendants failed to enforce it
6 such that the rest period would start late, be cut short, be interrupted, be less than net 10 minutes,
7 or otherwise be non-compliant; and (c) Defendants' intentional and systematic overloading of
8 work on Plaintiff and other employees such that they were unable to complete their assigned work
9 or meet Defendants' and/or customers' expectations and demands unless Plaintiff and other
10 employees cut their rest periods short and/or take late rest periods. Defendants did not pay rest
11 period premiums to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees when compliant rest periods were
12 not provided.

13 Unreimbursed Business Expenses

14 32. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and
15 similarly situated employees for necessary business-related expenses, including, but not limited to
16 the mileage expenses incurred when they had to drive to other stores owned and operated by
17 Defendants during their shifts using their personally owned vehicles, as well as using their
18 personal cell phone use to attend phone meetings and to communicate with managers. Defendants'
19 pattern and practice was to unlawfully shift the costs of doing business onto Plaintiff and similarly
20 situated employees by requiring them to pay these necessary work-related expenses out of their
21 own pockets.

22 Inaccurate Wage Statements

23 33. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and
24 similarly situated employees with accurate itemized wage statements, as required by California
25 Labor Code § 226(a). The number of hours worked and/or the corresponding hourly rates are
26 inaccurate as a consequence of Defendants' failure to pay all hours worked, failure to factor in
27 night shift differential as part of the regular rate, failure to record off-the-clock hours worked,
28 failure to pay and record meal and rest period premium wages.

1 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein
2 mentioned, Defendants were advised by skilled lawyers and other professionals, employees and
3 advisors knowledgeable about California labor and wage law, employment and personnel
4 practices, and about the requirements of California law.

5 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
6 should have known that Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were entitled to receive
7 minimum wage for all hours worked as well as overtime pay at one-and-a-half times the regular
8 rate of pay, but that Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were not paid all their hours worked
9 and/or were not paid at the correct rate.

10 36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
11 should have known that Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were entitled to receive all meal
12 periods as required by California law, or payment of one additional hour of pay at the regular rate
13 of pay when a compliant meal period was not provided.

14 37. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
15 should have known that Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were entitled to receive all rest
16 periods as required by California law, or payment of one additional hour of pay at the regular rate
17 of pay when a compliant rest period was not provided.

18 38. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
19 should have known that Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were entitled to receive
20 complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, and that such wage
21 statements were not provided.

22 39. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein
23 mentioned, Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff
24 and similarly situated employees, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such
25 compensation, but willfully, knowingly and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely represented to
26 Plaintiff and similarly situated employees that they were properly denied wages, all in order to
27 increase Defendants' profits.

28 40. California Labor Code § 218 states that nothing in Article 1 of the Labor Code shall

1 limit the right of any wage claimant to “sue directly . . . for any wages or penalty due to him [or
2 her] under this article.

3 41. At all relevant times, the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”), Lab. Code §
4 2698, *et seq.* was applicable to Plaintiff’s employment by Defendants.

5 42. At all relevant times, PAGA provides that any provision of the California Labor
6 Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA for violations
7 may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on
8 behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to procedures outlined
9 in Labor Code § 2699.3.

10 43. A civil action under PAGA may be brought by an “aggrieved employee,” who is
11 any person that was employed by the alleged violator and against whom one or more of the
12 alleged violations was committed.

13 44. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants and the alleged violations were committed
14 against her during her employment, and she is, therefore, an aggrieved employee. Plaintiff and
15 other employees are “aggrieved employees” as defined by Labor Code § 2699(c) in that they are
16 all current or former employees of Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations were
17 committed against them.

18 45. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2699.3 and 2699.5, an aggrieved employee, including
19 Plaintiff, may pursue a civil action arising under PAGA after the following requirements have
20 been met:

21 (a) The aggrieved employee shall give written notice (“PAGA Notice”) to the
22 LWDA via online submission) and the employer (by certified mail) of the
23 specific Labor Code provisions alleged to have been violated, including the
24 facts and theories in support.

25 (b) The LWDA shall provide notice to the employer and the aggrieved employee
26 by certified mail that it does not intend to investigate the alleged violation
27 within sixty (60) calendar days of the postmark date of the PAGA Notice.

28 Upon receipt of such Notice, or if the LWDA does not provide such notice

1 within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of the PAGA
2 Notice, the aggrieved employee may commence a civil action pursuant to
3 Labor Code § 2699 to recover civil penalties in addition to any other penalties
4 to which the employee may be entitled.

5 46. On February 9, 2026, Plaintiff provided the requisite written notice via online
6 submission to the LWDA and via certified mail to Defendant, LWDA Case No. LWDA-CM-
7 1156239-26, informing them of the specific Labor Code provisions alleged to have been violated,
8 including all facts and theories in support thereof.

9 47. To date, the LWDA has not responded to Plaintiff's PAGA Notice.

10 48. Plaintiff has satisfied the administrative prerequisites under Labor Code § 2699.3 to
11 recover civil penalties against Defendants, in addition to other remedies, for violations of Labor
12 Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1198, 2800, and 2802. Plaintiff has
13 also satisfied the administrative prerequisites to recover civil penalties against Defendants for
14 violations of Labor Code §§ 558 and 558.1.

15 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **Failure to Pay Minimum and Overtime Wages**

17 **(California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198)**

18 **(Against All Defendants)**

19 49. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
20 material allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

21 50. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are or have been
22 non-exempt hourly-paid employees of Defendants entitled to the protection of the California
23 Labor Code and applicable Wage Order.

24 51. Section 2 of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order
25 defines "hour worked" as the "time during which an employee is subject to the control of the
26 employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not
27 required to do." Section 4 of the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that "[e]very employer
28 shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, not less than the

1 applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period, whether the remuneration is
2 measured by time, piece, commission, or otherwise.”

3 52. California Labor Code § 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-
4 and-one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of 8 hours in a day or 40
5 hours in a week or for the first 8 hours worked on the seventh day of work, and to overtime
6 compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of 12 hours in a day or in
7 excess of 8 hours in a day on the seventh day of work.

8 53. California Labor Code § 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that it
9 is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half
10 or two-times that person’s regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the
11 person on a daily or weekly basis.

12 54. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to pay all wages,
13 including minimum and overtime wages, owed to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees.

14 55. Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff’s and similarly situated employees’ minimum
15 and overtime wages violates the provisions of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194 and 1198, and
16 is therefore unlawful.

17 56. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are entitled to recover their unpaid wages
18 and such general and special damages as may be appropriate and interest thereon.

19 57. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194, Plaintiff and similarly situated
20 employees are entitled to recover their unpaid regular and overtime wages, as well as interest,
21 costs, and attorneys’ fees.

22 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **Failure to Provide Compliant Meal Periods or Pay Premium Wage in Lieu Thereof**

24 **(California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a))**

25 **(Against All Defendants)**

26 58. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
27 material allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

28 59. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code

1 §§ 226.7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiff's and similarly situated employees' employment
2 by Defendants.

3 60. At all relevant times, California Labor Code § 226.7 provides that no employer
4 shall require an employee to work during any meal period mandated by an applicable IWC Wage
5 Order.

6 61. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code
7 § 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a
8 period of more than 5 hours per day without providing the employee with an uninterrupted meal
9 period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is
10 not more than 6 hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer
11 and the employee.

12 62. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code
13 section 512(a) further provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to
14 work for a period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second
15 uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is not
16 more than 12 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer
17 and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

18 63. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees who
19 were scheduled to work for a period of time no longer than 6 hours, and who did not waive their
20 legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than 5
21 hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

22 64. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees who
23 were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of 6 hours were required to work for periods
24 longer than 5 hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

25 65. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully required Plaintiff and
26 similarly situated employees to work during meal period and failed to compensate Plaintiff and
27 similarly situated employees for work performed during meal periods.

28 66. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants have failed to provide compliant

1 meal periods to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees, as required by California law. Plaintiff
2 and similarly situated employees were deprived of the opportunity to take a timely, duty-free meal
3 period of at least 30 minutes for every 5 hours of work due to the working conditions imposed by
4 Defendants. They were given a heavy workload which prevented or discouraged them from taking
5 compliant meal periods. Defendants often required Plaintiff and similarly situated employees to
6 work through their meal periods or take their meal periods late when Defendants failed to schedule
7 proper coverage on particular jobs. Further, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were not
8 relieved of all duties during meal periods because they were required to monitor a walkie talkie.

9 67. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and similarly
10 situated employees the full meal period premium wages owed for non-compliant meal periods
11 pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7.

12 68. Defendants' conduct violates the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California
13 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a).

14 69. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code § 226.7(b),
15 Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional
16 hour of pay at the employees' regular rate of pay as compensation for each work day that a
17 compliant meal period was not provided.

18 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **Failure to Provide Compliant Rest Periods or Pay Premium Wage in Lieu Thereof**

20 **(California Labor Code § 226.7)**

21 **(Against All Defendants)**

22 70. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
23 material allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

24 71. At all relevant times herein set forth, the applicable IWC Wage Order and
25 California Labor Code § 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiff's and similarly situated employees'
26 employment by Defendants.

27 72. At all relevant times, California Labor Code § 226.7 provides that no employer
28 shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the

1 California IWC.

2 73. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that “[e]very
3 employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as
4 practicable shall be in the middle of each work period” and that the “rest break time shall be based
5 on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or
6 major fraction thereof” unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3½) hours.

7 74. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and similarly
8 situated employees to work 4 or more hours without authorizing or permitting a 10-minute rest
9 period per each 4 hour period worked or major fraction thereof.

10 75. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide compliant rest
11 periods to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees, as required by California law. Plaintiff and
12 similarly situated employees were deprived of the opportunity to rest periods of at least 10 minutes
13 for each 4 hours worked or major fraction thereof for the same reasons set forth above regarding
14 the rest period claim.

15 76. Defendants did not pay rest period premiums to Plaintiff and similarly situated
16 employees when compliant rest periods were not provided.

17 77. Defendants’ conduct violates the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California
18 Labor Code § 226.7.

19 78. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code § 226.7(b),
20 Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional
21 hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay for compensation for each work day that the rest
22 period was not provided.

23 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **Failure to Pay Wages Timely Upon Termination**

25 **(California Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203)**

26 **(Against All Defendants)**

27 79. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
28 material allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

1 80. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if
2 an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are
3 due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or his employment,
4 his or his wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the
5 employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or his intention to quit, in which case the
6 employee is entitled to his or his wages at the time of quitting.

7 81. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other
8 similarly situated employees all wages owed upon the separation of their employment, including
9 the unpaid overtime wages and meal, rest, and recovery period premiums described herein.

10 82. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and those class members who are no longer
11 employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within 72
12 hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202
13 and 203.

14 83. All California employers know or should know that employees must be paid for all
15 hours worked, and must be paid overtime at a rate of one-and-a-half times the regular rate of pay
16 for overtime hours as defined by California law. Defendant's failure to abide by this well-
17 established law is willful and not in good faith.

18 84. California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay
19 wages owed, in accordance with §§ 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as
20 a penalty from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but
21 the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

22 85. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the statutory
23 penalty wages for each day they were not paid, up to a thirty (30) day maximum pursuant to
24 California Labor Code § 203.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business-Related Expenses

(California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802)

(Against All Defendants)

86. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the material allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

87. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 2802 provides that an employer must reimburse employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties.

88. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants required Plaintiff and similarly situated employees to absorb those necessary expenditures and losses, wrongfully shifting Defendants' cost of doing business onto Plaintiff and similarly situated employees.

89. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for necessary business-related expenses, including, but not limited to back braces and other equipment and supplies.

90. Defendants' pattern and practice was to unlawfully shift the costs of doing business onto Plaintiff and similarly situated employees by requiring them to pay these necessary work-related expenses out of their own pockets.

91. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are entitled to recover from Defendants their business-related expenses and the losses charged to them and incurred during the course and scope of their employment, plus interest and an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to California Labor Code § 2802.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

(California Labor Code § 226(a))

(Against All Defendants)

92. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the material allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

93. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or his employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing the following information: (1) gross wages earned; (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission; (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis; (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item; (5) net wages earned; (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; (7) the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number may be shown on the itemized statement; (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee

94. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The number of hours worked and/or the corresponding hourly rates are inaccurate as a consequence of Defendants' failure to pay regular and overtime wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, as set forth herein.

95. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and similarly situated employees have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

96. Specifically, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees have been injured by Defendants' intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage statements under California Labor Code § 226(a). Plaintiff and similarly situated employees have been injured by Defendants' intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) in that it has caused confusion over whether they had received all of the wages owed them, in addition to their difficulty and expense in reconstructing pay records and making mathematical computations to

1 analyze whether the wages paid them did in fact compensate them for all hours worked

2 97. Furthermore, Labor Code § 226(e)(2)(B) provides that an employee is deemed to
3 suffer injury if the wage statement fails to accurately and completely provide certain pieces of
4 information and the employee cannot promptly and easily determine such information from the
5 wage statement alone. In relevant part, Labor Code § 226(e)(2)(B) provides that an employee is
6 deemed to suffer injury if the wage statement does not accurately and completely state the total
7 number of hours worked by the employee, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
8 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

9 98. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are deemed to have suffered injury
10 because their wage statements did not provide complete and accurate information regarding the
11 total number of hours they worked in a given pay period, the applicable hourly rates in effect
12 during the pay period, and/or the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

13 99. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are entitled to recover from Defendants
14 the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor
15 Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 per employee.

16 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **Failure to Comply with Unfair Competition Law**

18 **(California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)**

19 **(Against All Defendants)**

20 100. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
21 material allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

22 101. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
23 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, similarly situated employees, and to the general public. Plaintiff
24 seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil
25 Procedure § 1021.5.

26 102. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and
27 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions
28 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

103. A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this case, Defendants' policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and similarly situated employees the proper hourly rates for all regular and overtime hours worked violates California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198; Defendants' policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and similarly situated employees to work through their meal periods without paying them proper compensation violates California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a); Defendants' policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and similarly situated employees to work through their meal periods without paying them proper compensation violates California Labor Code §§ 226.7; and Defendants' policy and practice of failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements violate California Labor Code § 226.

104. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees have been personally injured by Defendants' unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not necessarily limited to the loss of money and/or property.

105. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences 4 years prior to the filing of this complaint; a permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Penalties Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.*

(Private Attorneys General Act)

(Against All Defendants)

106. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the material allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

107. As discussed above, at all relevant times, PAGA was applicable to Plaintiff's employment by Defendants.

108. At all relevant times, PAGA provides that where civil penalties may be assessed

1 and collected by the LWDA for violations of the California Labor Code, such civil penalties may,
2 as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf
3 of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3.

4 109. A civil action under PAGA may be brought by an “aggrieved employee,” who is
5 any person that was employed by the alleged violator and against whom one or more of the
6 alleged violations were committed.

7 110. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants and the alleged violations were committed
8 against her during her employment, and she is, therefore, an aggrieved employee.

9 111. Plaintiff and other employees are “aggrieved employees” as defined by Labor Code
10 § 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees of Defendants, and one or more of the
11 alleged violations were committed against them.

12 112. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2699.3 and 2699.5, an aggrieved employee, including
13 Plaintiff, may pursue a civil action arising under PAGA after the following requirements have
14 been met:

- 15 (a) The aggrieved employee shall give PAGA Notice to the LWDA (via online
16 submission) and the employer (by certified mail) of the specific Labor Code
17 provisions alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories in
18 support thereof.
- 19 (b) The LWDA shall provide notice to the employer and the aggrieved employee
20 by certified mail that it does not intend to investigate the alleged violation
21 within sixty (60) calendar days of the postmark date of the PAGA Notice.
22 Upon receipt of such notice, or if the LWDA does not timely provide such
23 notice, the aggrieved employee may commence a civil action pursuant to
24 Labor Code § 2699 to recover civil penalties in addition to any other penalties
25 to which the employee may be entitled.

26 113. On February 9, 2026, Plaintiff provided the requisite PAGA Notice to the LWDA
27 and to Defendant Eastgate Petroleum, LLC, LWDA Case No. LWDA-CM-1156239-26, informing
28 them of the specific Labor Code provisions alleged to have been violated with facts and theories in

1 support thereof.

2 114. To date, the LWDA has not responded to Plaintiff's PAGA Notice.

3 115. At all relevant times, Labor Code § 558 provides that an employer or person acting
4 on behalf of an employer who violates (or causes to be violated) any provision of Labor Code §§
5 500 through 558 or any provision of the IWC Wage Orders regulating hours and days of work
6 shall be subject to civil penalties of \$50 to \$100 per pay period to each underpaid employee in
7 addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages, plus other civil penalties provided for
8 by law.

9 116. Plaintiff has satisfied the administrative prerequisites under Labor Code § 2699.3 to
10 recover civil penalties against Defendants, in addition to other remedies, for violations of Labor
11 Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, and 1198. Plaintiff has also satisfied
12 the administrative prerequisites to recover civil penalties against Defendants for violations of
13 Labor Code § 558.

14 **REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL**

15 Plaintiff requests a trial by jury.

16 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

17 Plaintiff, and on behalf of all others similarly situated, pray for relief and judgment
18 against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

19 **As to the First Cause of Action**

20 1. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
21 Labor Code §§ 510, 1194 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay
22 all wages, including minimum and overtime wages, owed to Plaintiff and similarly situated
23 employees;

24 2. For general unpaid wages at the applicable wage rates and such general and special
25 damages as may be appropriate;

26 3. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages commencing from the date such
27 amounts were due;

28 4. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to

1 California Labor Code § 1194(a); and

2 5. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

3 As to the Second Cause of Action

4 6. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
5 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all
6 meal periods to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees;

7 7. That the Court make an award to the Plaintiff and similarly situated employees of
8 one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a
9 compliant meal period was not provided;

10 8. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
11 proof;

12 9. For premiums pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(b);

13 10. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were
14 due; and

15 11. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

16 As to the Third Cause of Action

17 12. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
18 Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all rest
19 periods to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees;

20 13. That the Court make an award to the Plaintiff and similarly situated employees of
21 one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a
22 compliant rest period was not provided;

23 14. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
24 proof;

25 15. For premiums pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(b);

26 16. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were
27 due; and

28 17. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Fourth Cause of Action

18. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay Plaintiff and class members all compensation owed to them at the time of their termination of the employment;

19. For all actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

20. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203; and

21. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

22. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code § 2802 by unlawfully failing to indemnify Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for losses caused by Defendants' want of ordinary care and for the necessary expenditures or losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of Defendants;

23. For all actual damages, according to proof;

24. For pre-judgment interest on any necessary expenditures or losses paid by Plaintiff and similarly situated employees, from the date such amounts were paid; and

25. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 2802(c).

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

26. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders as to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

27. For all actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

28. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e); and

29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California

1 Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay Plaintiff and similarly situated
2 employees all wages due to them, including regular and overtime wages; failing to provide
3 compliant meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees and failing to pay
4 premium wages when compliant meal periods were not provided; failing to pay premium wages
5 when compliant rest periods were not provided; and failing to provide Plaintiff and similarly
6 situated employees with compliant wage statements under California Labor Code § 226.

7 31. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees and
8 prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

9 32. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all
10 funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants
11 as a result of violations of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*;

12 33. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
13 California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

14 34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

15 As to the Eighth Cause of Action

16 35. For civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699 (f) and (g) in the
17 amount of \$100 for each violation per pay period for the initial violation and \$200 for each
18 aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation, plus attorneys' fees and costs;

19 36. For civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 558 in the amount of \$50
20 per underpaid employee for each initial pay period in which the employee was underpaid and \$100
21 per underpaid employee for each subsequent pay period in which the employee was underpaid, in
22 addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages; and

23 37. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

Dated: June 8, 2026

AEQUITAS LEGAL GROUP

By: 

RONALD H. BAE
OLIVIA D. SCHARRER
CARSON M. TURNER

Attorneys for Plaintiff GLORIA MORALES

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18, and my business address is 1156 E. Green Street, Suite 200, Pasadena, California 91106.

On June 8, 2026, I served the document described as **FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT, CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 2698, ET SEQ.** on the following interested parties and/or their counsel in this action by the method(s) noted below:

Tracie Childs
Yousaf M. Jafri
OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART, P.C.
4660 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 900
San Diego, CA 92122
Telephone: (858) 652-3100
Facsimile: (858) 652-3101
Emails: tracie.childs@ogletreedeakins.com
yousaf.jafri@ogletreedeakins.com
alicia.martinez@ogletreedeakins.com
kristin.menchaca@ogletreedeakins.com

Attorneys for Defendant EASTGATE PETROLEUM, LLC

- ☐ **(BY FIRST CLASS MAIL):** I caused an envelope containing the above-described document to be deposited in the United States mail at Pasadena, California. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.
- ☒ **(BY EMAIL):** The above-described document was emailed to the above addressee(s)' email address(es) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1010.6(a).
- ☐ **(BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE):** I caused the above-described document to be served electronically via GreenFiling (authorized and court-approved Electronic Filing Service Provider).
- ☒ **(STATE):** I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.
- ☐ **(FEDERAL):** I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.

Executed on June 8, 2026, at Pasadena, California.


SEVANA WENN