

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)  
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)  
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)  
Michael L. Huggins, Esq. (SBN 305562)  
**LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP**  
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200  
Beverly Hills, California 90211  
Telephone: (310) 432-0000  
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001  
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com  
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com  
jklein@lelawfirm.com  
mhuggins@lelawfirm.com

**Electronically Filed  
by Superior Court of CA,  
County of Santa Clara,  
on 6/2/2026 12:54 PM  
Reviewed By: S. Rodriguez  
Env. #23942621**

**Case #26CV495277**

Attorneys for Plaintiff IAN THOMAS TAPPE,  
on behalf of himself and current and former aggrieved employees

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA**

IAN THOMAS TAPPE, on behalf of himself and  
current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

SUMMIT ESTATE RECOVERY CENTERS  
LLC; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 26CV495277

**PAGA ACTION**

**PLAINTIFF IAN THOMAS TAPPE'S  
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

**COMES NOW** Plaintiff IAN THOMAS TAPPE ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains  
against Defendants SUMMIT ESTATE RECOVERY CENTERS LLC; and DOES 1 to 100,  
inclusive (collectively "Defendants") as follows:

**I. INTRODUCTION**

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

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

## **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of thirty-five thousand dollars (\$35,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout California, including but not limited to Santa Clara County, at 7280 Blue Hill Drive, Suite 7, San Jose, CA 95129.

## **III. PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency on behalf of himself and other current and former employees subject to violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp

1 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently  
2 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by  
3 Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Santa Clara from in or around January  
4 16, 2023 until on or about October 15, 2025.

5 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant SUMMIT  
6 ESTATE RECOVERY CENTERS LLC is authorized to do business within the State of California  
7 and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all  
8 times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant SUMMIT ESTATE RECOVERY  
9 CENTERS LLC in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour  
10 practices or policies. Defendant SUMMIT ESTATE RECOVERY CENTERS LLC operates in  
11 Santa Clara County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Santa Clara County,  
12 including but not limited to, at 7280 Blue Hill Drive, Suite 7, San Jose, CA 95129.

13 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 1  
14 through 50 are corporations, or are other business entities or organizations of a nature unknown to  
15 Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California non-exempt employees, permitted  
16 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised control over the wages, hours and working  
17 conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

18 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 51  
19 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each of the individual defendants is sued  
20 individually and in his or her capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner, representative, manager,  
21 supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant who violated or caused to be  
22 violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor Code and/or any provision of the  
23 Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

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

1 complaint.

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

5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**  
7 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

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

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

11 8. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges  
12 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197,  
13 2802, 6401.7, 6401.9 and the applicable Wage Orders.

14 9. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California  
15 Labor Code:

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

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

25 12. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly  
26 non-exempt employees worked more minutes per shift than Defendants credited them with having  
27 worked. Specifically, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved  
28 California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages at the applicable minimum wage for all

1 hours worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited  
2 to:

3 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly  
4 non-exempt employees to remain on-duty during their off-the-clock meal breaks.

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

11 14. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant's  
12 conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendant  
13 would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

14 15. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay**  
15 **and/or failure to pay overtime wages at the proper rate of pay:** Defendants employed many of  
16 their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt employees. In California, an employer  
17 is required to pay hourly employees for all "hours worked," which includes all time that an employee  
18 is under control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered and permitted to work. This  
19 includes the time an employee spends, either directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to  
20 the benefit of the employer.'

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

24 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40) hours  
25 in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in  
26 any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-one-half  
27 (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve (12) hours  
28 in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay  
for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a  
workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an  
employee.

1 Labor Code section 510.

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

5 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly  
6 non-exempt employees to remain on-duty during their off-the-clock meal breaks.

7 18. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that  
8 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
9 Defendant would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
10 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

24 21. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an  
25 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of  
26 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the  
27 employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 5 at §11;  
28 *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ

1 an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee  
2 with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh  
3 hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period  
4 shall be considered an “on duty” meal period and counted as time worked. A paid “on duty” meal  
5 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved  
6 of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

7 22. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the  
8 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay  
9 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code  
10 sections 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 5 at §11.

11 23. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit legally required and compliant  
12 meal periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-  
13 exempt employees due to Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or procedures, including but not  
14 limited to:

15 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
16 hourly non-exempt employees timely, uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes  
17 for every five hours worked; and

18 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
19 hourly non-exempt employees a second uninterrupted duty-free meal period of no less than thirty  
20 (30) minutes for each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-  
21 based hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

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

27 25. Defendants’ foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff and  
28 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not receiving

1 wages to compensate them for workdays during which Defendants did not provide them with meal  
2 periods in compliance with California law.

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

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

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

21 29. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer must  
22 pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday the  
23 employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7; Wage  
24 Order 5 at § 12.

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

1 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
2 hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours worked  
3 or major fraction thereof; and

4 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
5 hourly non-exempt employees a third uninterrupted duty-free rest period of no less than ten (10) net  
6 minutes on each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
7 hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

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

13 32. Defendants' foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff and  
14 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not receiving  
15 wages to compensate them for workdays in which Defendants did not provide them with rest periods  
16 in compliance with California law.

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

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

25 35. Defendants have violated Labor Code Section 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiff  
26 and other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees' necessary  
27 expenditures they incurred in the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendants employed  
28 policies, practices, and/or procedures included, but not limited to:

1 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
2 hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours worked  
3 or major fraction thereof; and

4 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
5 hourly non-exempt employees a third uninterrupted duty-free rest period of no less than ten (10) net  
6 minutes on each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
7 hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

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

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

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

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

27 40. As a derivative of Plaintiff's claims above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to  
28 timely pay Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt

employees' earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages and/or rest period premium wages), in violation of Labor Code section 204. Defendants' aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in their failure to pay Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' their earned wages within the applicable time frames outlined in Labor Code section 204.

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

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

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

44. **Failure to Establish, Implement, and Maintain a Workplace Violence and Injury Prevention Program in Compliance with Labor Code Sections 6401.7 and 6401.9:** California Labor Code Section 6401.7 requires every employer to establish, implement, and maintain an effective injury prevention program. California Labor Code Section 6401.9 requires California employers to adopt a comprehensive Workplace Violence Prevention Plan (WVPP), train employees on workplace violence, log safety incidents, and conduct periodic inspections to evaluate workplace violence hazards.

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant did not comply with Defendant's responsibilities and duties

1 under Labor Code sections 6401.7 and 6401.9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges  
2 that Defendant (1) failed to establish, implement, and maintain an effective injury prevention  
3 program; (2) failed to adopt a compliant Workplace Violence Prevention Plan; (3); failed to train  
4 Employee and other aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees in workplace  
5 violence and injury prevention; (4) failed to log safety incidents; and (5) failed to conduct compliant  
6 periodic inspections. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional. Plaintiff also  
7 believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendant would further be liable  
8 for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

9       **45. Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section  
10 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an employee  
11 his or her wages, the employer must “furnish each of his or her employees ... an itemized statement  
12 in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any  
13 employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of  
14 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare  
15 Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee  
16 is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all deductions made on written orders  
17 of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive  
18 dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her  
19 social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all  
20 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours  
21 worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

22       **46.** As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff  
23 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages  
24 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period  
25 premium wages) rendered Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based  
26 hourly non-exempt employees’ wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section  
27 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

28       **47.** Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

1           48. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
2 Defendant would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
3 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

13           51. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

14           52. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.  
15 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section  
16 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

21           54. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code  
22 section 2699.3. On March 27, 2026, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and  
23 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of  
24 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the  
25 violations alleged.

26           55. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by  
27 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code  
28 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the

1 parties notice within 60 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends  
2 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

3 56. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil  
4 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7,  
5 510, 512, 1194, 6401.7 and 6401.9: During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the  
6 present, preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in  
7 the following amounts:

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

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

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

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

25 e. For violations of Labor Code section 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for  
26 each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, or any  
27 willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee,  
28 plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code

1 section 225.5].

2 57. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g), Plaintiff is entitled to an award of  
3 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with his claims for civil penalties.

4 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 **WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND ON OTHER AGGRIEVED**  
6 **EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:**

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

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

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

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

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

17  
18 Dated: June 2, 2026

Respectfully submitted,  
**LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP**

19  
20 By: /s/ Michael L. Huggins  
21 Joseph Lavi, Esq.  
22 Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.  
23 Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.  
24 Michael L. Huggins, Esq.  
25 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
26 IAN THOMAS TAPPE,  
27 on behalf of himself and current and former  
28 aggrieved employees