

1 Shaun Setareh (SBN 204514)
shaun@setarehlaw.com
2 Victoria Mas (SBN 365896)
vmass@setarehlaw.com
3 SETAREH LAW GROUP
420 N. Camden Drive, Suite 100
4 Beverly Hills, California 90210
Telephone (310) 888-7771
5 Facsimile (310) 888-0109

SUMMONS ISSUED

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff BRUCE EASLEY

Per local Rule, This case is assigned to
Judge Marquez, Leonard E., for all purposes.

9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

10 FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

11 UNLIMITED JURISDICTION

12 BRUCE EASLEY, on behalf of himself and
13 all other aggrieved employees, and the general
public,

14 *Plaintiff,*

15 v.

16 AAHS SAN PABLO, LLC, a California
17 Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,

18 *Defendants.*

Case No. C26-01682

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

COMPLAINT

1. Civil Penalties (Lab. Code § 2698, *et seq.*)

REPRESENTATIVE-ACTION COMPLAINT

1 Plaintiff BRUCE EASLEY ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of himself and all other aggrieved
2 employees, and the general public, complains and alleges as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this representative action against defendants AAHS SAN PABLO,
5 LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, (collectively
6 referred to as "Defendants") for alleged violations of the Labor Code. As set forth below, Plaintiff
7 alleges that Defendants have

8 (1) failed to provide Plaintiff and all other similarly situated individuals with meal
9 periods;

10 (2) failed to provide them with rest periods;

11 (3) failed to pay them premium wages for missed meal and/or rest periods;

12 (4) failed to pay them at least minimum wage for all hours worked;

13 (5) failed to pay them overtime wages at the correct rate;

14 (6) failed to provide them with accurate written wage statements; and

15 (7) failed to pay them all of their final wages following separation of employment.

16 Based on these alleged violations, Plaintiff now brings this class action to recover unpaid wages,
17 restitution, civil penalties, and related relief on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,
18 all other aggrieved employees, and the State of California.

19 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

20 2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction to hear this case because the unpaid wages,
21 actual damages, liquidated damages, restitution, and penalties sought by Plaintiff from Defendants
22 exceeds the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court of the State of California.

23 3. Venue is proper in COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA pursuant to Code of Civil
24 Procedure §§ 395(a) and 395.5 in that liability arose there, because at least some of the transactions
25 that are the subject matter of this Complaint occurred therein and/or each defendant is found,
26 maintains offices, transacts business, and/or has an agent therein.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **PARTIES**

2 4. Plaintiff is and was, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, an individual
3 residing in the State of California.

4 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that Defendant AAHS
5 SAN PABLO, LLC is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a California Limited Liability
6 Company doing business in the State of California.

7 6. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of the defendants sued herein as
8 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names.
9 Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE defendants
10 when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that each of the
11 fictitiously named defendants are responsible in some manner for the occurrences, acts and
12 omissions alleged herein and that Plaintiff's alleged damages were proximately caused by these
13 defendants, and each of them. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege both the true names and
14 capacities of the DOE defendants when ascertained.

15 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that, at all relevant times
16 mentioned herein, some or all of the defendants were the representatives, agents, employees,
17 partners, directors, associates, joint venturers, joint employers, principals, or co-participants of some
18 or all of the other defendants, and, in doing the things alleged herein, were acting within the course
19 and scope of such relationship and with the full knowledge, consent, and ratification by such other
20 defendants.

21 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

22 8. Plaintiff worked for Defendants as an hourly, non-exempt employee since October
23 16, 2023.

24 **Clock In Process**

25 9. Plaintiffs and the aggrieved employees were trained to clock in using Defendants'
26 timeclock on the premises. Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees would typically have to wait in
27 line for approximately five minutes before clocking in as Defendants only maintained one timeclock
28 for the whole facility.

1
2 10. Accordingly, by the time Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were able to clock in,
3 five minutes or more may have already passed. This time was not properly recorded as time worked
4 and resulted in Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees not being paid for all hours worked by
5 Defendants.

6 **Missed Meal Periods**

7 11. Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were not provided with meal periods of at
8 least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not
9 scheduling each meal period as part of each work shift; (2) chronically understaffing each work
10 shift with not enough workers; (3) imposing so much work on each employee such that it made it
11 unlikely that an employee would be able to take their breaks if they wanted to finish their work on
12 time; and (4) no formal written meal and rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their
13 meal and rest periods.

14 12. As a result of Defendants' policy, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were
15 regularly not provided with uninterrupted meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five
16 (5) hours worked due to complying with Defendants' productivity requirements that required
17 Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to work through their meal periods in order to complete their
18 assignments on time.

19 13. Defendants expected Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to remain on-call during
20 their meal periods, ready to respond to radio calls and assist patients if needed.

21 **Missed Rest Periods**

22 14. Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were not provided with rest periods of at least
23 ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1)
24 Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift; (2) chronically
25 understaffing each work shift with not enough workers; (3) imposing so much work on each
26 employee such that it made it unlikely that an employee would be able to take their breaks if they
27 wanted to finish their work on time; and (4) no formal written meal and rest period policy that
28 encouraged employees to take their meal and rest periods.

15. As a result of Defendants' policy, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were regularly not provided with uninterrupted rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hours worked due to complying with Defendants' productivity requirements that required Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to work through their rest periods in order to complete their assignments on time.

Wage Statements

16. Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were not provided with accurate wage statements as mandated by law pursuant to Labor Code § 226.

17. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code 0167 226(a)(1) as “gross wages earned” were not accurately reflected in that all hours worked, including overtime and “off-the-clock” work were not included.

18. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(2) as “total hours worked by the employee” were not accurately reflected in that all hours worked, including overtime and “off-the-clock” work were not included.

19. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(5) as “net wages earned” were not accurately reflected in that all hours worked, including overtime and “off-the-clock” work were not included.

20. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(9) as “all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee” were not accurately reflected in that all hours worked, including overtime and “off-the-clock” work were not included.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

CIVIL PENALTIES

(Lab. Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*)

21. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

22. During the applicable limitations period, Defendants have violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, and 1198.

23. Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on behalf of

1 himself and other current and former employees, to bring a representative civil action to recover
2 civil penalties pursuant to the procedures set forth in Labor Code § 2699.3 that may, but need not,
3 be brought or maintained as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

4 24. Plaintiff, a former employee against whom Defendants committed one or more of the
5 alleged Labor Code violations during the applicable limitations period, is an aggrieved employee
6 within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699(c).

7 25. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
8 § 2699.3. Notice was provided to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency
9 (“LWDA”) and 65 days have elapsed without the LWDA providing Plaintiff with any notice of an
10 intent to investigate.

11 26. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff seeks the following civil
12 penalties for Defendants’ violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7, 510,
13 512, 1194, 1197, and 1198:

- 14 i. For violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 212, 226.7, 1194, and 1198,
15 one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee per pay period for each initial
16 violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee per pay period
17 for each subsequent violation (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2));
- 18 ii. For violations of Labor Code § 203, a penalty in an amount not exceeding
19 thirty (30) days’ pay as waiting time (penalties set by Labor Code § 256);
- 20 iii. For violations of Labor Code § 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
21 employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional,
22 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus 25% of the amount
23 unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each initial violation that was
24 either willful or intentional, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each
25 employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld
26 from each employee, for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the
27 subsequent violation was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor
28 Code § 210);

- 1 iv. For violations of Labor Code § 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
2 employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional,
3 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent
4 (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each
5 initial violation that was either willful or intentional, and two hundred dollars
6 (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount
7 unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each subsequent violation,
8 regardless of whether the subsequent violation was either willful or
9 intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 225.5);
- 10 v. For violations of Labor Code § 226(a), if this action is deemed to be an initial
11 citation, two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each employee for each
12 violation. Alternatively, if an initial citation or its equivalent occurred before
13 the filing of this action, one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each employee for
14 each violation (penalties set by Labor Code § 226.3);
- 15 vi. For violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50) for each
16 employee for each initial pay period for which the employee was underpaid,
17 and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee for each subsequent pay
18 period for which the employee was underpaid (penalties set by Labor Code §
19 558);
- 20 vii. For violations of Labor Code § 1197, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
21 aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1197 that was
22 intentional and two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved
23 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation of Labor Code §
24 1197, regardless of whether the initial violation was intentional (penalties set
25 by Labor Code § 1197.1);
- 26 viii. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g), Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable
27 attorneys' fees and costs in connection with Plaintiff's claims for civil
28 penalties.


1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, all other current and former non-exempt
3 employees, and the general public, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- 4 (1) Declaratory relief;
5 (2) Pre-judgment interest;
6 (3) Civil penalties;
7 (4) Costs of suit;
8 (5) Reasonable attorneys' fees; and
9 (6) Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

10
11 Dated: May 14, 2026

SETAREH LAW GROUP

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SHAUN SETAREH
VICTORIA MAS
Attorneys for Plaintiff
BRUCE EASLEY