

1 Daniel J. Hyun (State Bar No. 309184)
dhyun@arisllp.com

2 Shelly Song (State Bar No. 312036)
ssong@arisllp.com

3 **ARIS LLP**

1 Park Plaza, Ste. 600
Irvine, California 92614
Telephone: 949.807.4467
Facsimile: 949.807.4469

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
LUIS MEJIA

8
9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 **COUNTY OF ORANGE**

11 LUIS MEJIA, an individual, on behalf of himself
12 and others similarly situated,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 ALERTOS CORP. dba SABROSADA;
16 ALERTOS MEXICAN FOOD 1 LLC;
17 ALERTOS MEXICAN FOOD 2, L.L.C.;
18 ALERTOS MEXICAN FOOD 3, L.L.C.;
19 ALERTOS MEXICAN FOOD 4, L.L.C.;
20 ALERTOS MEXICAN FOOD 5, L.L.C.; and
21 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

22 Defendants.

Case No. 30-2026-01551526-CU-OE-CXC

Assigned for all purposes to:
Hon. William D. Claster, Dept. CX101

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT**

1. Failure to Pay All Wages;
2. Failure to Provide Meal Periods or Compensation;
3. Failure to Permit Rest Periods or Provide Compensation;
4. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
5. Waiting Time Penalties;
6. Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses;
7. Violation of the Unfair Competition Law; and
8. Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act.

Action Filed: March 2, 2026
Trial Date: None Set

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff LUIS MEJIA (“Plaintiff”), individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated,
2 brings this First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint (“Complaint”) against
3 Defendants ALERTOS CORP. dba SABROSADA; ALERTOS MEXICAN FOOD 1 LLC;
4 ALERTOS MEXICAN FOOD 2, L.L.C.; ALERTOS MEXICAN FOOD 3, L.L.C.; ALERTOS
5 MEXICAN FOOD 4, L.L.C.; ALERTOS MEXICAN FOOD 5, L.L.C.; and DOES 1 through 50,
6 inclusive (collectively, “Defendants”), and alleges as follows:
7

8 **INTRODUCTION**

9 1. Plaintiff brings this putative class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
10 382 against Defendants, on behalf of himself individually and a putative class of California citizens
11 who are and were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees throughout California during
12 the Class Period (collectively the “Class” or “Class Members”). The term Class Period is defined as
13 four (4) years prior to the filing of this action to the date of class certification.

14 2. Plaintiff also brings this representative action pursuant to the PAGA, Labor Code
15 sections 2698 *et seq.*, against Defendants, on behalf of himself individually and other aggrieved
16 employees who are and were employed by Defendants throughout California during the PAGA Period.
17 The term PAGA Period is defined as one (1) year prior to Plaintiff’s notice of Labor Code violations
18 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendants until judgment.

19 3. Defendants own and operate Mexican restaurants called Sabrosada in California.

20 4. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have engaged in a systematic pattern of wage and hour
21 violations under the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage
22 Orders, and California Business and Professions Code that have damaged Plaintiff and Class
23 Members, and contribute to Defendants’ deliberate unfair competition.

24 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants have violated
25 and continue to violate state wage and hour laws by, among other things:

26 (a) failing to pay all wages (including minimum, regular, overtime and double time
27 wages);

28 (b) failing to provide lawful meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof;

1 (c) failing to authorize or permit rest breaks or provide compensation in lieu thereof;
2 (d) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements;
3 (e) failure to reimburse business expenses; and
4 (f) failing to pay all wages due upon separation of employment.
5 6. Plaintiff seeks monetary relief against Defendants on behalf of himself and the putative
6 class and aggrieved employees to recover, among other things, unpaid wages, liquidated damages,
7 restitution, interest, attorneys' fees, costs, and penalties pursuant to Labor Code Sections 201-204,
8 206, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 256, 510, 512, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198,
9 2698 *et seq.*, 2800, and 2802 and California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5.

11 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

12 7. This is a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 and
13 representative action pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2698 *et seq.* ("PAGA"). The monetary
14 damages, restitution, penalties, and other amounts sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal
15 jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

16 8. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution,
17 Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes, except those
18 given by statutes to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any
19 other basis for jurisdiction. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff
20 seeks relief authorized by California law.

21 9. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and belief,
22 they have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of
23 the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts
24 consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

25 10. Venue is proper in this Court under Code of Civil Procedure Sections 395(a) and 395.5
26 because, upon information and belief, Defendants reside, transact business, maintain offices, and/or
27 have an agent or agents in this county, and the acts and omissions alleged herein took place in this
28

1 county.

2 **PARTIES**

3 11. Plaintiff is a California citizen. Defendants employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt
4 employee during the Class Period. During his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff's job duties
5 consisted of, *inter alia*, cooking and preparing customer food orders. Plaintiff's employment with
6 Defendants ended within one (1) year of the filing of this action.

7 12. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times Defendant
8 Alertos Corp. dba Sabrosada ("Alertos Corp.") is a California corporation that owns and operates one
9 or more Mexican restaurants called "Sabrosada." Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges
10 that Alertos Corp. maintains its principal business location at 16607 Camilia Ave., Tustin, CA 92782.
11 Plaintiff is further informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, Alertos Corp.
12 regularly conducted and conducts business within the State of California and derives substantial
13 revenues from services performed in California. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges
14 that, at all relevant times, Alertos Corp. was and is an employer subject to California state wage and
15 hour laws.

16 13. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times Defendant
17 Alertos Mexican Food 1 LLC ("Alertos 1") is a California limited liability company that owns and
18 operates one or more Mexican restaurants called "Sabrosada." Plaintiff is informed, believes and
19 thereon alleges that Alertos 1 maintains its principal business location at 15681 Brookhurst St.,
20 Westminster, CA 92683. Plaintiff is further informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant
21 times, Alertos 1 regularly conducted and conducts business within the State of California and derives
22 substantial revenues from services performed in California. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon
23 alleges that, at all relevant times, Alertos 1 was and is an employer subject to California state wage
24 and hour laws.

25 14. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times Defendant
26 Alertos Mexican Food 2, L.L.C. ("Alertos 2") is a California limited liability company that owns and
27 operates one or more Mexican restaurants called "Sabrosada." Plaintiff is informed, believes and
28

1 thereon alleges that Alertos 2 maintains its principal business location at 17225 Brookhurst St.,
2 Fountain Valley, CA 92708. Plaintiff is further informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all
3 relevant times, Alertos 2 regularly conducted and conducts business within the State of California and
4 derives substantial revenues from services performed in California. Plaintiff is informed, believes and
5 thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, Alertos 2 was and is an employer subject to California state
6 wage and hour laws.

7 15. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times Defendant
8 Alertos Mexican Food 3, L.L.C. (“Alertos 3”) is a California limited liability company that owns and
9 operates one or more Mexican restaurants called “Sabrosada.” Plaintiff is informed, believes and
10 thereon alleges that Alertos 3 maintains its principal business location at 12500 Beach Blvd., Stanton,
11 CA 90680. Plaintiff is further informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, Alertos
12 3 regularly conducted and conducts business within the State of California and derives substantial
13 revenues from services performed in California. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges
14 that, at all relevant times, Alertos 3 was and is an employer subject to California state wage and hour
15 laws.

16 16. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times Defendant
17 Alertos Mexican Food 4, L.L.C. (“Alertos 4”) is a California limited liability company that owns and
18 operates one or more Mexican restaurants called “Sabrosada.” Plaintiff is informed, believes and
19 thereon alleges that Alertos 4 maintains its principal business location at 1770 S. Harbor Blvd.,
20 Anaheim, CA 92802. Plaintiff is further informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant
21 times, Alertos 4 regularly conducted and conducts business within the State of California and derives
22 substantial revenues from services performed in California. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon
23 alleges that, at all relevant times, Alertos 4 was and is an employer subject to California state wage
24 and hour laws.

25 17. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times Defendant
26 Alertos Mexican Food 5, L.L.C. (“Alertos 5”) is a California limited liability company that owns and
27 operates one or more Mexican restaurants called “Sabrosada.” Plaintiff is informed, believes and
28

1 thereon alleges that Alertos 5 maintains its principal business location at 24342 El Toro Rd., Laguna
2 Woods, CA 92637. Plaintiff is further informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times,
3 Alertos 5 regularly conducted and conducts business within the State of California and derives
4 substantial revenues from services performed in California. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon
5 alleges that, at all relevant times, Alertos 5 was and is an employer subject to California state wage
6 and hour laws.

7 18. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times Defendants
8 Alertos Corp., Alertos 1, Alertos 2, Alertos 3, Alertos 4, and Alertos 5 maintain their mailing addresses
9 at the same location, at 15333 Culver Dr, Ste 340-554, Irvine, CA 92604, and designated the same
10 individual named Margarita Aleman as the agent for service of process, who is also the Chief
11 Executive Officer for each entity. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants shared, among other things, and
12 not limited to, their non-exempt employee work force such that Plaintiff and other non-exempt
13 employees were directed by Defendants to work at more than one of Defendants' restaurant locations
14 during a workday, workweek, and/or pay period during the Class Period.

15 19. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that at all times hereinafter
16 mentioned, Defendants were and are subject to the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders as employers,
17 whose employees were and are engaged throughout this county and the State of California.

18 20. Defendants continue to employ non-exempt employees within California.

19 21. Defendant DOES 1 through 50, are sued under fictitious names pursuant to Code of
20 Civil Procedure Section 474 because Plaintiff does not know their true names or capacities. Plaintiff
21 will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint and serve such fictitiously named Defendants when
22 their names and capacities are ascertained.

23 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DOES 1 through 50 are or
24 were the partners, agents, owners, shareholders, managers, or employees of Defendants at all relevant
25 times.

26 23. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each Defendant acted in all
27 respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendant, carried out a joint scheme, business
28

1 plan, or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable
2 to the other Defendants.

3 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each Defendant directly or
4 indirectly, through agents or other persons or entities, employed or otherwise exercised control over
5 the wages, hours, and working conditions of Plaintiff. Furthermore, each Defendant in all respects
6 acted as the employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and the Class Members.

7 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and all of the acts and
8 omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to, Defendants and/or DOES 1 through
9 50, acting as the agent, alter ego, agent, servant, joint venturer, co-conspirator, and/or partner for the
10 other, within a common enterprise and legal authority to act on the other's behalf. The acts of any and
11 all Defendants were in accordance with, and represent, the official policy of Defendants.

12 26. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, acted within the scope of such
13 agency or employment, or ratified each and every act or omission complained of herein. At all relevant
14 times, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of each and all the other
15 Defendants in proximately causing the damages herein alleged.

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

19 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

20 28. Plaintiff brings this class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 on
21 behalf of himself and all others similarly situated who were injured by Defendants' violations of the
22 Labor Code, Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*, and IWC Wage Orders during
23 the Class Period.

24 29. Plaintiff's proposed Class consists of and is defined as follows:

25 Class

26 All California citizens currently or formerly employed by Defendants as non-exempt
27 employees throughout the state of California within four (4) years prior to the
28

commencement of this action to the date of class certification.

30. Plaintiff also seeks to certify the following Subclass:

Waiting Time Subclass

All Class Members who separated from their employment with Defendants at any time within three (3) years prior to the filing of this action to the date of class certification (“Subclass” or “Waiting Time Subclass”).

31. Members of the Class and Subclass described above will be collectively referred to as “Class Members.”

32. Plaintiff reserves the right to modify or re-define the Class or Subclass, establish additional subclasses, or modify or re-define any class or subclass definition as appropriate based on investigation, discovery, and specific theories of liability.

33. There is a well-defined community of interest in this litigation and the proposed Class and Subclass are readily ascertainable.

34. **Commonality:** This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action under the California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 because there are common questions of law and fact as to the Class Members that predominate over any questions affecting only individual members including, but not limited to, the following:

- (a) Whether Defendants paid Plaintiff and Class Members all wages (including minimum, regular, overtime and double time wages) for all hours worked and at the correct rates;
- (b) Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to work off-the-clock without compensation;
- (c) Whether Defendants provided Plaintiff and Class Members with compliant meal periods or paid compensation in lieu thereof;
- (d) Whether Defendants authorized and permitted compliant rest breaks to Plaintiff and Class Members or paid compensation in lieu thereof;
- (e) Whether Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate itemized wage statements;

- 1 (f) Whether Defendants failed to timely pay Class Members all wages due immediately
2 upon termination or within 72 hours of resignation;
3 (g) Whether Defendants failed to reimburse business expenses;
4 (h) Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless; and
5 (i) Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of Business and
6 Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*

7 35. There is a well-defined community of interest. Further, Plaintiff and Class Members
8 have suffered common injuries as a result of Defendants' systemic employment policies and practices.
9 Looking to Defendants' employment policies and practices, the Court can adjudicate the lawfulness
10 of those policies and practices on a class-wide basis, according to proof, and issue an award to Plaintiff
11 and Class Members accordingly. In addition, answers to common questions raised in this Complaint
12 will advance resolution of each individual Class Member's claims.

13 36. **Numerosity:** The Class Members are so numerous that joinder of all members is
14 impractical. Although the members of the entire Class and Subclass are unknown to Plaintiff at this
15 time, on information and belief, the class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals.

16 37. **Ascertainability:** The identities of the Class Members are readily ascertainable by
17 inspection of Defendants' employment and payroll records.

18 38. **Typicality:** The claims (or defenses, if any) of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the
19 Class Members because Defendants' failure to comply with the provisions of California's wage and
20 hour laws entitled each Class Member to similar pay, benefits, and other relief. The injuries sustained
21 by Plaintiff are also typical of the injuries sustained by Class Members because they arise out of and
22 are caused by Defendants' common course of conduct as alleged herein.

23 39. **Adequacy:** Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of all
24 Class Members because it is in Plaintiff's best interest to prosecute the claims alleged herein to obtain
25 full compensation and penalties due to Plaintiff and the Class Members. Plaintiff's attorneys, as
26 proposed class counsel, are competent and experienced in litigating large employment class actions
27 and versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has
28

incurred and, throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur attorneys' fees and costs that have been and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of the Class Members.

40. **Superiority:** The nature of this action makes 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 for the entire Class and Subclass at the same time. If appropriate, this Court can, and is empowered to, fashion methods to efficiently manage this case as a class action.

41. **Public Policy Considerations:** 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 class members who are not named in the complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights while affording them privacy protections.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

42. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other persons as non-exempt employees at Defendants' Sabrosada restaurant locations within California. Defendants employed Plaintiff in a non-exempt position during Plaintiff's employment and continue to employ other non-exempt employees within California.

43. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein mentioned, Defendants were advised by skilled lawyers, employees, and other professionals who were knowledgeable about California's wage and hour laws, employment and personnel practices, and the requirements of California law.

44. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and Class Members, and Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation but willfully, knowingly and intentionally failed to do so

1 all in order to increase Defendants' profits.

2 45. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
3 have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive at least minimum wages, wages
4 at their regular rate of pay, overtime and double time wages, and that they were not receiving
5 minimum, regular, overtime and double time wages for all work that was required to be performed.
6 Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Plaintiff and Class Members regularly
7 worked in excess of eight (8) hours per workday, 10 hours per workday, 12 hours per workday, and/or
8 over 40 hours per workweek. For example, Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to drive
9 from one of Defendants' restaurant locations to another to fill staffing shortages, including to cover
10 for another Class Members' work shift. Defendants, however, did not pay Plaintiff and Class Members
11 for this travel time, as they were required to clock out before driving to the other location and being
12 able to clock in again. Moreover, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to properly calculate and pay
13 for all minimum and overtime hours at the correct rates when Plaintiff and Class Members worked at
14 multiple locations in a workday, workweek, and/or pay period. Additionally, Plaintiff and Class
15 Members were required to remain at the Defendants' worksite during their shifts, including during any
16 unpaid meal period hours. Furthermore, Defendants rounded Plaintiff's and Class Members' work
17 hours to Defendants' benefit, such as paying Plaintiff and Class Members based on their scheduled
18 work hours rather than the actual hours they worked. In sum, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff
19 and Class Members for all hours that they were under the Defendants' control and failed to pay
20 overtime wages at the correct rates of pay. As such, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other Class
21 Members minimum, regular, overtime and double time wages for all hours worked in violation of the
22 Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

23 46. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
24 have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive a timely, off-duty, uninterrupted
25 30-minute meal period for every five (5) hours of work, or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay
26 at their regular rate of pay when they did not receive a compliant meal period. In violation of the
27 Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members had their meal periods missed, late,
28

1 and/or restricted to the worksite due to Defendants' work demands, understaffing, policies, and
2 practices. For example, Plaintiff and Class Members could not take a first meal period until after the
3 fifth hour of work because Defendants did not provide enough staff coverage, and at times, could not
4 take a meal period at all during their shifts. Defendants also failed to provide second meal periods
5 when Plaintiff and Class Members worked in excess of 10 hours in a workday. Furthermore,
6 Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to take their meal periods at the worksite. Despite
7 these violations, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and other Class Members with an additional
8 hour of pay at their regular rate for every day in which they suffered a meal period violation. As such,
9 Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other Class Members all required meal periods or premium
10 pay, in violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

11 47. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
12 have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive a 10-minute, off-duty,
13 uninterrupted rest period for every four (4) hours worked, or major fraction thereof, or payment of one
14 (1) additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when they were not permitted to take a compliant
15 rest period. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Defendants failed to provide
16 compliant rest breaks to Plaintiff and Class Members due to their work demands, understaffing,
17 policies, and practices as mentioned above. For example, Defendants maintained a policy and practice
18 of insufficiently staffing their business operations such that Plaintiff and Class Members regularly had
19 to forgo and miss their rest periods to tend to Defendants' customers. Defendants also failed to provide
20 third rest breaks when Plaintiff and Class Members worked in excess of 10 hours in a workday. As a
21 result, Plaintiff and Class Members regularly had their rest breaks missed and/or required to remain at
22 the worksite at all times during their shifts. Despite these violations, Defendants failed to compensate
23 Plaintiff and other Class Members with an additional hour of pay at their regular rate for every day in
24 which they suffered a rest period violation. As such, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other
25 Class Members all required rest periods or premium pay, in violation of the Labor Code and IWC
26 Wage Orders.

27 48. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that during the Class Period,
28

1 Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for all necessary business expenses
2 incurred for Defendants' benefit. For example, Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to
3 use their personal cell phones to communicate with their supervisors and managers without
4 reimbursement for a reasonable portion of their cell phone bills. Plaintiff and Class Members also had
5 to drive their own personal vehicles to travel between Defendants' restaurant locations during a
6 workday to cover other employees' shifts, without reimbursement for mileage and wear and tear on
7 their vehicles. Additionally, Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to wear a uniform
8 bearing Defendants' logo and required Plaintiff and Class Members to pay for, and maintain uniforms,
9 which were heavily soiled. At various times during the Class Period, Plaintiff and Class Members had
10 to purchase and maintain additional uniforms at their own expense. Accordingly, Defendants violated
11 the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders.

12 49. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
13 have known that Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass Members who separated from their employment
14 with Defendants during the statutory period were entitled to timely payment of all wages due. In
15 violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Waiting Time Class Members did
16 not receive payment of all wages owed upon separation within the permissible time period due to,
17 *inter alia*, Defendants' failure to pay all wages including minimum, straight time, overtime and double
18 time wages, reimbursements, and failure to pay meal and rest period premiums to Class Members.

19 50. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants knew or should
20 have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive complete and accurate wage
21 statements. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members were
22 not furnished with complete and accurate wage statements that show all of the information required
23 by Labor Code Section 226, including, but not limited to, the name and address of the legal entity that
24 is the employer, the gross and net wages earned, the total hours worked, all applicable hourly rates in
25 effect during the pay period, and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

26 ///

27 ///

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES
(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

51. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

52. At all times herein relevant, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Sections 204, 206, 510, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and all applicable local minimum wage ordinances in effect throughout California.

53. Labor Code Section 204 and the IWC Wage Orders require timely payment of all wages owed on regularly scheduled paydays at least twice during each calendar month, on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays. All wages earned in excess of the normal work period must be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period.

54. Labor Code Section 206 provides that in case of a dispute over wages, the employer shall pay, without condition and promptly under the Labor Code all wages conceded due, leaving to the employee all remedies he/she is otherwise entitled to as to any balance claimed.

55. The IWC Wage Orders define “hours worked” as “the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.”

56. Labor Code Section 510 and the IWC Wage Orders require that employers pay employees for all overtime hours at a rate of one and one-half times the employee’s regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one (1) workday, 40 hours in one (1) workweek, and after the first eight hours on the seventh consecutive workday in one (1) workweek. Labor Code Section 510 and the IWC Wage Orders further require that employers pay employees double their regular rate of pay for hours work in excess of 12 hours in a workday and after eight hours on the seventh consecutive workday in one (1) workweek. Labor Code Section 510 requires payment of overtime wages at one and one half times the “regular rate of pay,” which includes all forms of remuneration earned by the employee.

1 57. Labor Code Section 1182.12 sets forth the minimum hourly wage that must be paid to
2 all employees in California for all hours worked. Local minimum wage ordinances, may provide for
3 higher minimum wage rates that must be paid to employees for all hours worked in those locales where
4 each local ordinance is in effect. Labor Code Section 1197 affirms that it is unlawful to pay less than
5 the state or local minimum wage, whichever is higher, for any hour of work.

6 58. Labor Code Section 1194 requires that employers pay employees at least the legal
7 minimum wage rate for all hours worked, notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage.
8 Labor Code Section 1194 further authorizes any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage
9 applicable to the employee to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of wages,
10 along with interest thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

11 59. Labor Code Section 1194.2 authorizes the recovery of liquidated damages in an amount
12 equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon for unpaid wage violations.

13 60. Labor Code Section 1198 prohibits employers from employing for longer hours or less
14 favorable conditions than those set forth in the Labor Code, IWC Wage Orders, or as otherwise set by
15 the Labor Commissioner.

16 61. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to timely pay Plaintiff and Class
17 Members all wages due.

18 62. In violation of California law, Defendants have knowingly and willfully refused to
19 perform their obligations and compensate Plaintiff and Class Members for all wages earned as alleged
20 above.

21 63. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members all earned minimum, regular,
22 overtime and double time wages in accordance with Labor Code Sections 204, 206, 510, 1182.12,
23 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198, the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and all applicable local minimum
24 wage ordinances in effect throughout California, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover
25 the full amount of unpaid wages, liquidated damages, prejudgment interest, and statutory penalties,
26 along with attorneys' fees and costs in amounts that will be established at trial.

27 64. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants, through their
28

1 conduct described herein, have committed an “intentional theft of wages in an amount greater than
2 nine hundred fifty dollars (\$950) from any one employee, or two thousand three hundred fifty dollars
3 (\$2,350) in the aggregate from two or more employees...in any consecutive 12-month period” within
4 the meaning of California Penal Code section 487m. Specifically, Defendants have intentionally
5 deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of wages, as defined in Labor Code section 200, benefits, or
6 other compensation, by unlawful means, with the knowledge that the wages, benefits, or other
7 compensation is due to Plaintiff and Class Members under the law. Plaintiff and the Class Members
8 he seeks to represent are thus entitled to recover from Defendants treble damages and costs, including
9 reasonable attorneys’ fees, pursuant to California Penal Code section 496(c).

10 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
11 **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
12 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

13 65. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though
14 fully set forth herein.

15 66. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Sections 226.7
16 and 512, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

17 67. Labor Code Section 512 and the IWC Wage Orders prohibit an employer from
18 employing any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing a meal
19 period of not less than 30 minutes (commencing before the employee’s fifth hour of work), except that
20 if the total work period per day is no more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual
21 consent of the employer and employee. A second meal period of not less than 30 minutes is required
22 if an employee works more than 10 hours per day and must begin before the employee’s tenth hour of
23 work, except if the total hours worked is no more than 12 hours, the second meal period may be waived
24 by mutual consent of the employer and employee, but only if the first meal period was not waived.
25 An employer must relieve an employee of all duties during meal periods.

26 68. The applicable IWC Wage Orders state that “[u]nless the employee is relieved of all
27 duty during a 30-minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an ‘on duty’ meal period
28

1 and counted as time worked.”

2 69. Labor Code Section 226.7(b) and the IWC Wage Orders prohibit an employer from
3 requiring any employee to work during a meal period mandated by any California statute, regulation,
4 standard or order. If an employer fails to provide an employee with a meal period in accordance with
5 state law, Labor Code Section 226.7(c) and the IWC Wage Orders require that the employer pay the
6 employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each
7 workday that the meal period is noncompliant.

8 70. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive compliant
9 meal periods for working more than five (5) hours and/or 10 hours per workday. Specifically, Plaintiff
10 and Class Members had their meal periods missed, late, and/or restricted to the worksite due to
11 Defendants’ work demands, understaffing, policies, and practices. In addition, Defendants failed to
12 provide second meal periods to Plaintiff and Class Members when they worked in excess of 10 hours
13 in a workday.

14 71. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members
15 meal period premiums for noncompliant meal periods pursuant to Labor Code Section 226.7(b) and
16 the applicable IWC Wage Order.

17 72. As a result of Defendants’ failure to provide compliant meal periods and pay meal
18 period premiums to Plaintiff and Class Members in accordance with the IWC Wage Orders and Labor
19 Code Sections 226.7 and 512, Plaintiff and Class Members suffered and continue to suffer a loss of
20 wages and compensation.

21 73. Because Plaintiff and Class Members were and/or are entitled to such meal periods or
22 “premium pay” in lieu thereof, they are entitled to such payment per shift in an amount according to
23 proof. To the extent such unpaid premiums are deemed unpaid wages, Plaintiff will also seek pre- and
24 post-judgment interest as provided by law at 10% per annum, in an amount according to proof.

25 74. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants, through their
26 conduct described herein, have committed an “intentional theft of wages in an amount greater than
27 nine hundred fifty dollars (\$950) from any one employee, or two thousand three hundred fifty dollars
28

1 (\$2,350) in the aggregate from two or more employees...in any consecutive 12-month period” within
2 the meaning of California Penal Code section 487m. Specifically, Defendants have intentionally
3 deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of wages, as defined in Labor Code section 200, benefits, or
4 other compensation, by unlawful means, with the knowledge that the wages, benefits, or other
5 compensation is due to Plaintiff and Class Members under the law. Plaintiff and the Class Members
6 he seeks to represent are thus entitled to recover from Defendants treble damages and costs, including
7 reasonable attorneys’ fees, pursuant to California Penal Code section 496(c).

8 75. Also, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5, Plaintiff will seek attorneys’
9 fees and costs from Defendants in an amount subject to proof and approved by the Court.

10 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**
11 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
12 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

13 76. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though
14 fully set forth herein.

15 77. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Section 226.7
16 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

17 78. The IWC Wage Orders require employers to authorize and permit all employees to take
18 10-minute duty-free rest periods for each four (4) hours worked, or major fraction thereof.

19 79. If an employer fails to provide an employee with a rest period in accordance with
20 California law, Labor Code Section 226.7(c) and the IWC Wage Orders require that the employer pay
21 the employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each
22 workday that the rest period is noncompliant.

23 80. During the relevant time period, Defendants did not implement a compliant rest break
24 policy and/or practice. Consequently, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive a 10-minute rest
25 period for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof because their rest breaks were
26 regularly missed and/or restricted to the worksite due to Defendants’ work demands, understaffing,
27 policies, and procedures. In addition, Defendants failed to provide and/or authorize a third 10-minute
28

1 rest break to Plaintiff and Class Members when they worked in excess of 10 hours in a workday.

2 81. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members
3 rest period premiums for noncompliant rest periods pursuant to Labor Code Section 226.7(b) and the
4 applicable IWC Wage Order.

5 82. As a result of Defendants' failure to provide compliant rest periods and pay rest period
6 premiums to Plaintiff and Class Members in accordance with the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code
7 Sections 226.7 and 516, Plaintiff and Class Members suffered and continue to suffer a loss of wages
8 and compensation.

9 83. Because Plaintiff and Class Members were and/or are entitled to such rest periods or
10 "premium pay" in lieu thereof, they are entitled to such payment per shift in an amount according to
11 proof. To the extent such unpaid premiums are deemed unpaid wages, Plaintiff will also seek pre- and
12 post-judgment interest as provided by law at 10% per annum, in an amount according to proof.

13 84. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants, through their
14 conduct described herein, have committed an "intentional theft of wages in an amount greater than
15 nine hundred fifty dollars (\$950) from any one employee, or two thousand three hundred fifty dollars
16 (\$2,350) in the aggregate from two or more employees...in any consecutive 12-month period" within
17 the meaning of California Penal Code section 487m. Specifically, Defendants have intentionally
18 deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of wages, as defined in Labor Code section 200, benefits, or
19 other compensation, by unlawful means, with the knowledge that the wages, benefits, or other
20 compensation is due to Plaintiff and Class Members under the law. Plaintiff and the Class Members
21 he seeks to represent are thus entitled to recover from Defendants treble damages and costs, including
22 reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to California Penal Code section 496(c).

23 85. Also, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5, Plaintiff will seek attorneys'
24 fees and costs from Defendants in an amount subject to proof and approved by the Court.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**
3 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

4 86. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though
5 fully set forth herein.

6 87. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Section 226.

7 88. Labor Code Section 226(a) requires that, semimonthly or at the time of each payment
8 of wages, employers must furnish each employee with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing
9 that accurately shows (1) gross wages earned, (2) total number of hours worked, (3) the number of any
10 piece-rate units earned and all applicable piece rates, (4) all deductions made from wages, (5) net
11 wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period, (7) the name and last four digits or employment
12 identification number of the employee, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the
13 employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect and the corresponding number of hours worked
14 at each hourly rate.

15 89. Labor Code Section 226(e)(1) authorizes an employee suffering injury as a result of a
16 knowing and intentional failure by an employer to provide an accurate itemized wage statement to
17 recover the greater of all actual damages or \$50 for the initial pay violation and \$100 for each violation
18 in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of \$4,000 per employee, in addition to
19 an award of costs and attorneys' fees.

20 90. During the relevant time period, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally failed
21 to comply with Labor Code Section 226(a) on wage statements that were provided to Plaintiff and
22 Class Members. The deficiencies include, among other things, Defendants' failure to correctly state
23 the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, gross and net wages earned, the total
24 hours worked, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, and the corresponding number
25 of hours worked at each hourly rate.

26 91. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code Section 226(a), Plaintiff
27 and Class Members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights. Specifically,
28

1 Plaintiff and Class Members have been injured by Defendants' intentional violation of California
2 Labor Code Section 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their
3 protected interest in receiving, accurate itemized wage statements under California Labor Code
4 Section 226(a). Plaintiff has had to file this lawsuit in order to determine the extent of the
5 underpayment of wages, thereby causing Plaintiff to incur expenses and lost time. Plaintiff would not
6 have had to engage in these efforts and incur these costs had Defendants provided the accurate wages
7 earned and number of hours worked at each corresponding pay rate. This has also delayed Plaintiff's
8 ability to demand and recover the underpayment of wages from Defendants.

9 92. Defendants' violations of California Labor Code Section 226(a) prevented Plaintiff and
10 Class Members from knowing, understanding and disputing the wages paid to them, and resulted in
11 an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional
12 failure to comply with California Labor Code Section 226(a), Plaintiff and Class Members have
13 suffered an injury, and the exact amount of damages and/or penalties is all in an amount to be shown
14 according to proof at trial.

15 93. Plaintiff and Class Members are also entitled to injunctive relief under California Labor
16 Code Section 226(h), compelling Defendants to comply with California Labor Code Section 226, and
17 seek the recovery of attorneys' fees and costs incurred in obtaining this injunctive relief.

18 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**

20 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

21 94. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though
22 fully set forth herein.

23 95. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Sections 201,
24 202, and 203. Defendants failed to comply with these final paycheck requirements with respect to
25 Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass Members.

26 96. Labor Code Section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the
27 wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.
28

97. Labor Code Section 202 requires that if “an employee not having a written contract for a definite period” quits, the employee’s wages shall become due and payable no later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

98. Labor Code Section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, any wages of an employee who is discharged or quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced, but that the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days per employee.

99. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass Members all their earned wages upon termination including, but not limited to, minimum, regular, overtime and double time compensation, premium compensation, and/or reimbursements either at the time of discharge or within 72 hours of leaving Defendants' employ.

100. As a result of Defendants' failure to timely pay all wages owed to Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass Members in accordance with Labor Code Sections 201, 202 and 203, Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass Members are entitled to recover waiting time penalties, prejudgment interest, attorneys' fees, and costs in amounts that will be established at trial.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

101. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

102. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Sections 2800 and 2802. Defendants failed to comply with these indemnification and reimbursement requirements with respect to Plaintiff and Class Members.

103. Labor Code Section 2800 requires employers to indemnify employees for losses caused by the employer's want of ordinary care. To the extent Defendants claim that Plaintiff and Class

1 Members failed to request, demand, notify or otherwise seek reimbursement for their expenses and
2 losses, Defendants were obligated to nevertheless indemnify Plaintiff and Class Members due to their
3 own negligence.

4 104. Labor Code Section 2802(a) requires that employers indemnify and reimburse
5 employees for all business expenses, which are defined as all necessary expenditures or losses incurred
6 by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of the employee's duties or otherwise incurred
7 based on the employee's obedience to the employer's directions. Labor Code Section 2802(b)
8 authorizes employees to recover in a court action interest which shall accrue from the date on which
9 the employee incurred the necessary expenditure or loss. Labor Code Section 2802(c) authorizes
10 employees, who to enforce their right to reimbursements under Labor Code Section 2802, to also
11 recover attorneys' fees and costs.

12 105. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and other
13 Class Members for all business expenses incurred for Defendants' benefit in violation of Labor Code
14 Sections 2800 and 2802.

15 106. As a result of Defendants' failure to indemnify and reimburse Plaintiff and Class
16 Members for all business and work-related costs, expenditures, losses and expenses in accordance
17 with Labor Code Sections 2800 and 2802, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover the full
18 unreimbursed balance of reimbursements, expenditures and losses, prejudgment interest, and statutory
19 penalties, along with attorneys' fees and costs in amounts that will be established at trial.

20 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **VIOLATION OF THE UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW**

22 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

23 107. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though
24 fully set forth herein.

25 108. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful
26 and harmful to Plaintiff and Class Members. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the
27 public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5.
28

1 109. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, violate California law and constitute unlawful
2 business acts or practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et*
3 *seq.*

4 110. A violation of Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.* may be
5 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law.

6 111. Defendants' policies and practices have violated state law in at least the following
7 respects:

- 8 (a) Failing to pay all minimum, regular, overtime and double time wages due to Plaintiff
9 and Class Members and at the correct rates in violation of Labor Code Sections 204,
10 206, 510, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198;
11 (b) Failing to provide meal periods without paying Plaintiff and Class Members premium
12 wages for every day in which a meal period was not provided in violation of Labor
13 Code Sections 226.7 and 512;
14 (c) Failing to authorize or permit rest breaks without paying Plaintiff and Class Members
15 premium wages for every day in which a rest break was not authorized or permitted in
16 violation of Labor Code Section 226.7;
17 (d) Failing to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate itemized wage statements
18 in violation of Labor Code Section 226;
19 (e) Failing to timely pay all earned wages to Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass Members
20 upon separation of employment in violation of Labor Code Sections 201, 202 and 203;
21 and
22 (f) Failing to reimburse business expenses in violation of Labor Code Sections 2800 and
23 2802.

24 112. Defendants intentionally avoided paying Plaintiff and Class Members wages and
25 monies, thereby creating for Defendants an artificially lower cost of doing business in order to
26 undercut their competitors and establish and gain a greater foothold in the marketplace.

27 113. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Sections 17202, 17203, and 17208, Plaintiff
28

1 and Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages unlawfully withheld and retained by
2 Defendants during a period that commences four (4) years prior to the filing of this action; an award
3 of attorneys' fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and
4 an award of costs.

5 114. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to an injunction, restitution, and other
6 equitable relief against such unlawful practices to return all funds over which Plaintiff and Class
7 Members have an ownership interest and to prevent future damage pursuant to Business and
8 Professions Code Sections 17200 *et seq.*

9 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

11 **(Against All Defendants)**

12 115. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though
13 fully set forth herein.

14 116. California Labor Code Section 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of
15 action to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: "Notwithstanding any other provision of
16 law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the
17 Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
18 agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a
19 civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or
20 former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3."

21 117. On February 2, 2026, Plaintiff gave written notice of the specified provisions alleged
22 to have been violated by Defendants including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations,
23 as required by Labor Code section 2699.3 and paid the filing fee. This written notice was provided via
24 certified mail to Defendants and to the LWDA by electronically filing the notice via the Department
25 of Industrial Relations' website. More than 65 days have passed since Plaintiff submitted his PAGA
26 notice to the LWDA without a response from the LWDA. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a
27 civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code Section 2699 pursuant to Section 2699.3 for the
28

1 violations of the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited
2 to, penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558(a), 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

3 118. The statute of limitations is tolled while a plaintiff exhausts his or her administrative
4 remedies with the LWDA prior to suit, which is required by Labor Code Section 2699.3(d).

5 119. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants' violation of California Labor Code
6 Section 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 1174.5, any person, including any entity,
7 employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by California
8 Labor Code Section 1174 is subject to a penalty under Section 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC
9 Order Section 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins
10 and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.
11 Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order Section 7(A)(5), every employer shall keep total
12 hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

13 120. Defendants' conduct violates numerous Labor Code sections, including, but not limited
14 to, the following:

- 15 (a) Violation of Labor Code Sections 201-204, 206, 210, 256, 510, 558, 1194, 1197,
16 1197.1, and 1198 for failure to timely pay all earned wages (including minimum,
17 regular, and overtime wages) owed to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees during
18 employment and upon separation of employment as herein alleged;
- 19 (b) Violation of Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512 for failure to provide meal periods to
20 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees and failure to pay premium wages for missed
21 meal periods as herein alleged;
- 22 (c) Violation of Labor Code Section 226.7 for failure to permit rest periods to Plaintiff and
23 other aggrieved employees and failure to pay premium wages for missed rest periods
24 as herein alleged;
- 25 (d) Violation of Labor Code Sections 226 and 226.3 for failure to provide accurate
26 itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as herein alleged;
- 27 (e) Violation of Labor Code Sections 1174 and 1174.5 for failure to maintain accurate
28

records regarding the employment of Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as herein alleged; and

- (f) Violation of Labor Code Sections 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse business expenses to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as herein alleged.

121. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699(c)(1), Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” because he was employed by the alleged violators and personally suffered each of the alleged violations committed against him, and therefore is properly suited to represent the interests of all other aggrieved employees.

122. Plaintiff has exhausted the procedural requirements under Labor Code section 2699.3 as to Defendants and is therefore able to pursue a claim for penalties on behalf of himself and all other aggrieved employees under PAGA.

123. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2699(a), 2699.3 and 2699.5, Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil penalties, injunctive relief, in addition to other remedies, for violations of the Labor Code sections cited above.

124. For bringing this action, Plaintiff is entitled to attorney’s fees and costs incurred herein pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699(g)(1).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated and other Class Members, other aggrieved employees, and the State of California, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. For certification of this action as a class action, including certifying the Class and Subclass alleged by Plaintiff;
2. For appointment of Plaintiff Luis Mejia as the class representative;
3. For appointment of Aris LLP as class counsel for all purposes;
4. For compensatory damages in an amount according to proof with interest thereon;
5. For economic and/or special damages in an amount according to proof with interest thereon;

6. For damages, monetary relief, wages, premiums, benefits and penalties, including interest thereon;
7. For Plaintiff and Waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor Code Section 203;
8. For the amounts provided for in Labor Code Section 226.7;
9. For liquidated damages pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194.2;
10. For statutory penalties to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;
11. For restitution to Plaintiff and Class Members of all money and property unlawfully acquired by Defendants through unfair or unlawful business practices pursuant to Business and Professions Code Sections 17200 *et seq.*;
12. For an order requiring Defendants to restore and disgorge all funds to each employee acquired by means of any act or practice declared by this Court to be unlawful, unfair or fraudulent and, therefore, constituting unfair competition under Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*;
13. For permanent injunctive relief described in the UCL, and PAGA causes of action;
14. For prejudgment interest on all sums recovered pursuant to Labor Code Section 218.6 and Civil Code Sections 3287 and 3289, and applicable law;
15. For post judgment interest on all amounts awarded to Plaintiff and Class Members as provided by law;
16. For recovery of attorneys' fees and costs provided by Labor Code Sections 218.6, 226, 1194, 2802, and Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5;
17. For a declaratory judgment that the practices complained of herein are unlawful under California law;
18. Such other equitable relief as the Court may deem proper; and
19. For treble damages;
20. For PAGA penalties; and
21. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

1 Dated: April 10, 2026

ARIS LLP

2
3 By: 

Daniel J. Hyun

4 Shelly Song

Attorneys for Plaintiff LUIS MEJIA

5
6 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

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

8
9 Dated: April 10, 2026

ARIS LLP

10
11 By: 

Daniel J. Hyun

12 Shelly Song

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff LUIS MEJIA

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 **SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE**

3 I am employed in the County of Orange, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a
4 party to the within action. My business address is 1 Park Plaza, Ste. 600, Irvine, CA 92614. On April
5 10, 2026, I served the foregoing documents:

6 • **FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**

7 on all interested parties in this action as follows:

8 **** SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST ****

9 **[X] (BY E-MAIL)** In accordance with the court's order authorizing electronic service, other
10 authority, and/or agreement between/among the parties, I transmitted a true and copy of this
11 document(s), in pdf. and/or word format via electronic transmission to the electronic mail address(es)
listed below for each addressee, and received no reply messages indicating delivery failure.

12 **[X] (STATE)** I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California
13 that the foregoing is true and correct.

14 Executed on April 10, 2026.

15 
16 _____
Becker Moreno

17 **Service List**

18 **VIA ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION**

19 Kelsey Javier, Esq.
20 kjavier@fisherphillips.com
21 Ashley Pham, Esq.
22 apham@fisherphillips.com
23 Kaitlin Hall, Esq.
24 kphall@fisherphillips.com
25 Elizabeth Abina
eabina@fisherphillips.com
FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP

26 Attorneys for Defendants ALERTOS CORP. dba SABROSADA; ALERTOS MEXICAN FOOD 1
27 LLC; ALERTOS MEXICAN FOOD 2, L.L.C.; ALERTOS MEXICAN FOOD 3, L.L.C.;
28 ALERTOS MEXICAN FOOD 4, L.L.C.; and ALERTOS MEXICAN FOOD 5, L.L.C.