

MILLS SADAT DOWLAT LLP
Arash Sadat (SBN 279282)
Camron Dowlatsahi (SBN 308618)
Mir Raza (SBN 358311)
515 South Flower Street, Suite 1000
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Tel.: (213) 628-3856
Email: arash@msdlawyers.com
Email: camron@msdlawyers.com
Email: mir@msdlawyers.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Atalina Pritchard
and the Putative Class

Electronically Filed
by Superior Court of CA,
County of Santa Clara,
on 8/14/2026 1:39 PM
Reviewed By: M. Johnson
Env. #24813801

-
Case #26CV500899

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

ATALINA PRITCHARD, individually, and
on behalf of other members of the general
public similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

SOCIAL VOCATIONAL SERVICES, INC.,
a California corporation; and DOES 1 through
10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 26CV500899

**CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

- (1) **Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy**
- (2) **Sexual Harassment (Gov. Code § 12940, subd. (j))**
- (3) **Failure to Prevent Harassment (Gov. Code § 12940, subd. (k))**
- (4) **Retaliation in Violation of FEHA (Gov. Code § 12940, subd. (h))**
- (5) **Retaliation for Reporting Sexual Harassment (Labor Code § 1102.5)**
- (6) **Failure to Pay Minimum Wage for All Hours Worked (Lab. Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1197.1)**
- (7) **Failure to Pay Overtime Compensation (Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198)**
- (8) **Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, and IWC Wage Orders)**
- (9) **Failure to Provide Rest Periods (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, and IWC Wage Orders)**

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

- (10) Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses (Lab. Code § 2802)**
- (11) Waiting Time Penalties (Lab. Code §§ 201-203)**
- (12) Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements (Lab. Code § 226)**
- (13) Violation of Unfair Competition Law (Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*)**
- (14) Private Attorneys General Act (Lab. Code § 2698, *et seq.*)**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARY STATEMENT..... 1

THE PARTIES..... 3

 A. Plaintiff 3

 B. Defendants 3

VENUE AND JURISDICTION 4

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION..... 5

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO THE FIRST THROUGH FIFTH..... 5

CAUSES OF ACTION 5

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO THE SIXTH THROUGH FOURTEENTH CAUSES OF
ACTION 8

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS 11

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION 14

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION 15

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION 16

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION 16

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION 17

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION 18

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION 19

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION 20

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION..... 22

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION 23

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION 24

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION..... 24

THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION 25

FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION 27

PRAYER FOR RELIEF 29

1 Plaintiff Atalina Pritchard, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general
2 public similarly situated, brings this action against Defendant Social Vocational Services, Inc., and
3 Does 1 through 10, inclusive, and alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendant Social Vocational Services, Inc., and
6 Does 1 through 10 (collectively, “Defendants”) for violations of California employment law,
7 including (a) violations of the California Labor Code and unfair business practices stemming from
8 Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime compensation, failure to
9 provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to maintain accurate
10 records of hours worked and meal periods, failure to timely pay all wages to employees, failure to
11 indemnify necessary business expenses, and failure to furnish accurate wage statements; and (b)
12 wrongful termination in violation of public policy, sexual harassment, failure to prevent
13 harassment, and retaliation.

14 2. Plaintiff brings the First through Fifth Causes of Action solely in her individual
15 capacity and not on behalf of the Class.

16 3. Plaintiff brings the Sixth through Thirteenth Causes of Action individually and as a
17 class action on behalf of herself and certain current and former employees of Defendants
18 (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members” and defined more fully
19 below). The Class consists of Plaintiff and all other persons who have been employed by any
20 Defendants in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee during the statute of limitations
21 period applicable to the claims pleaded here.

22 4. Plaintiff brings the Fourteenth Cause of Action as a representative action under the
23 Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties that are owed to Plaintiff, the
24 State of California, and past and present employees of Defendants employed at any time within the
25 applicable statutory period (hereinafter referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”).

26 5. Defendants own and operate an industry, business, and establishment within the
27 State of California, including in Santa Clara County. As such, Defendants are subject to the
28

1 California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”), and
2 the California Business and Professions Code.

3 6. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period Defendants maintained
4 a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

5 a. Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum
6 wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;

7 b. Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in
8 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing to maintain accurate
9 records of all meal periods taken or missed, and failing to pay an additional hour’s pay for each
10 workday in which a meal period violation occurred;

11 c. Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
12 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, and failing to pay
13 an additional hour’s pay for each workday in which a rest period violation occurred;

14 d. Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, meal period
15 premium wages, and rest period premium wages due within the time period specified by California
16 law when employment terminates;

17 e. Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked;
18 and

19 f. Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements
20 containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

21 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that Defendants were on
22 actual and constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to
23 rectify their unlawful policies. Defendants’ violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times
24 herein were willful and deliberate.

25 8. At all relevant times, Defendants were legally responsible for all of the unlawful
26 conduct, policies, practices, acts, and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing
27 paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff and the Class. Further, Defendants are responsible for each
28

of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of “respondeat superior.”

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

9. Plaintiff Atalina Pritchard (“Plaintiff”) is an individual residing in the County of Santa Clara, California and worked as a non-exempt Community Inclusion Facilitator from on or about September 8, 2025 to June 8, 2026.

10. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v. American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

B. Defendants

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that Defendant Social Vocational Services, Inc. (“SVS”) is:

a. a California corporation with its principal place of business in the County of Los Angeles, California.

b. a business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Santa Clara County; and

c. the current or former employer of Plaintiff and of the putative Class. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the Class to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

12. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names and capacities of the defendants sued as Does 1 through 10, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged and that Plaintiff’s damages were proximately caused by said defendants’ conduct.

13. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1 through 10, inclusive, and each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the

jurisdiction of, and/or injured Plaintiff and a significant number of the Class in the State of California.

14. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that at all relevant times each Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and the other employees described in the class definitions below, and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

15. The wrongful conduct alleged against the Defendants occurred in the County of Santa Clara, California. At all relevant times, the conduct at issue was part of a continuous and ongoing pattern of behavior.

16. This Court is the proper forum to adjudicate this action because the wrongful acts that are the subject of this action occurred here and because the Defendant now resides in its jurisdictional area.

17. Plaintiff has complied with and/or exhausted any applicable claims statutes and/or administrative and/or internal remedies and/or grievance procedures, and/or is excused from complying therewith. Plaintiff was issued a right-to-sue notice on or about July 10, 2026. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's "Right to Sue" letter is attached as **Exhibit A**.

//

//

1 **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

2 18. Plaintiff Atalina Pritchard began working for Defendant Social Vocational Services,
3 Inc. (“SVS”) on September 8, 2025, as an hourly-paid, non-exempt Community Inclusion
4 Facilitator. Before engaging in the protected activity described below, Plaintiff had no material
5 disciplinary or performance issues and received positive feedback from colleagues and
6 supervisors.

7 **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO THE FIRST THROUGH FIFTH**
8 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

9 A. **The Harasser Sexually Harasses Plaintiff, and SVS Fails to Protect Her**

10 19. Throughout Plaintiff’s employment, an SVS client (“the Harasser”) repeatedly
11 subjected her to unwelcome sexual touching, including caressing and groping her. Plaintiff
12 understood that SVS was already aware of the Harasser’s conduct because he had also sexually
13 harassed or physically assaulted several of her coworkers. Plaintiff reported the Harasser’s conduct
14 to management on multiple occasions, including after individual incidents, but SVS failed to take
15 effective corrective action.

16 20. On or about December 29, 2025, the Harasser touched and caressed Plaintiff’s chest
17 and breast area despite her efforts to redirect him and establish boundaries. Plaintiff reported to
18 Program Director Dulce Moreno (“Ms. Moreno”) and the Harasser’s case manager that the
19 Harasser had repeatedly touched her inappropriately and that she felt unsafe working with him.
20 Ms. Moreno instructed Plaintiff to document the conduct in a service note so that it could be
21 addressed during the Harasser’s behavioral meetings. ACT Stephanie Lopez (“Ms. Lopez”) told
22 Plaintiff that she would no longer be assigned to work with the Harasser.

23 21. The Harasser’s inappropriate conduct remained a concern to Plaintiff during
24 transitions, group changes, and in common areas, where the Harasser could approach Plaintiff even
25 when she was not directly assigned to him. In March 2026, SVS again assigned Plaintiff to work
26 with the Harasser despite her prior complaints and Ms. Lopez’s assurance.

27 22. On March 30, 2026, Plaintiff met with Ms. Moreno and Ms. Lopez to object to the
28 assignment. Before the meeting began, Ms. Moreno directed that the office door remain open.

1 Plaintiff was uncomfortable discussing a sensitive sexual-harassment complaint where employees
2 passing by could overhear the conversation. Ms. Moreno nevertheless told Plaintiff that she would
3 still be required to work with the Harasser. After the meeting, Plaintiff observed Ms. Lopez
4 laughing with Ms. Moreno, which Plaintiff understood as mocking or trivializing her complaint.

5 23. Later that day, Plaintiff complained to Ms. Moreno in writing about SVS's handling
6 of the matter. Plaintiff explained that the meeting should have been conducted with greater privacy
7 and sensitivity, that leaving the door open allowed others to overhear the discussion, and that Ms.
8 Lopez had laughed after the meeting. Plaintiff further explained that she had been assigned to the
9 Harasser despite multiple prior incidents in which he had groped and touched her inappropriately,
10 that her efforts to establish boundaries and redirect him had been unsuccessful, and that she felt
11 unsafe working with him. After Ms. Moreno failed to respond, Plaintiff sent a follow-up email the
12 following day.

13 24. On March 31, 2026, Plaintiff elevated her complaints to Human Resources
14 Representative Darryl Noble ("Mr. Noble"). Mr. Noble stated that SVS would investigate
15 Plaintiff's complaint and that she would no longer be assigned to work with the Harasser. SVS
16 never informed Plaintiff of any investigative findings or other meaningful corrective action.

17 25. Shortly thereafter, SVS required Plaintiff and several coworkers to attend training
18 concerning clients who engaged in inappropriate touching. The training focused on redirection and
19 behavioral strategies that Plaintiff and her coworkers had already attempted with the Harasser
20 without success. During the training, employees discussed multiple incidents involving the
21 Harasser, and management acknowledged that he refused to follow redirection.

22 26. During the training, the trainer asked whether the employee who had been sexually
23 harassed was present. Before Plaintiff could respond, Ms. Moreno identified Plaintiff in front of
24 her coworkers as the employee involved. Ms. Moreno also stated that everyone attending the
25 training would be required to work with the Harasser in the future. That statement contradicted
26 Human Resources' written assurance that Plaintiff would no longer be assigned to him.

27 27. On May 6, 2026, SVS again assigned Plaintiff to work with the Harasser. Plaintiff
28 objected to Ms. Lopez and reminded her that Human Resources had stated that she would not be

1 required to work with him. Ms. Lopez changed the assignment, but later that day Ms. Moreno
2 called Plaintiff into a meeting and informed her that Case Manager Jen would be present as a
3 witness.

4 28. During the meeting, Ms. Moreno asserted that Human Resources had only intended
5 to excuse Plaintiff from working with the Harasser until Plaintiff completed the training. Ms.
6 Moreno stated that, because Plaintiff had now attended the training, she would be required to work
7 with the Harasser notwithstanding his prior conduct.

8 29. Ms. Moreno then contacted Regional Director Merita Amituanai (“Ms.
9 Amituanai”), who likewise stated that Plaintiff would be required to work with him. Throughout
10 the meeting, Ms. Moreno repeatedly interrupted Plaintiff and dismissed her concerns. Plaintiff
11 thereafter complained to Mr. Noble that management was attempting to force her to work with the
12 Harasser despite her prior complaints and Human Resources’ assurance.

13 **B. SVS Retaliates Against Plaintiff and Constructively Terminates Her**
14 **Employment**

15 30. After Plaintiff repeatedly complained about the sexual harassment and SVS’s
16 failure to protect her, Ms. Moreno, Ms. Lopez, and other management personnel subjected Plaintiff
17 to heightened scrutiny and less favorable treatment. Among other things, they denied her support
18 provided to other employees, repeatedly changed her routes and assignments, held her to standards
19 not applied to similarly situated employees, and addressed her in a harsher and more dismissive
20 manner.

21 31. On May 12, 2026, SVS issued Plaintiff a written warning for unsatisfactory
22 attendance. The warning included absences supported by doctors’ notes and dates on which
23 Plaintiff left work early at management’s direction. SVS did not impose comparable discipline on
24 other employees who engaged in similar conduct.

25 32. The continuing harassment, repeated efforts to reassign Plaintiff to the Harasser,
26 failure to take effective corrective action, and ensuing retaliation caused Plaintiff substantial stress
27 and anxiety and rendered her working conditions intolerable. On June 8, 2026, Plaintiff resigned
28 and provided notice that her last day would be June 12, 2026. SVS accepted her resignation

effective immediately. Under the circumstances, Plaintiff's resignation constituted a constructive discharge.

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO THE SIXTH THROUGH FOURTEENTH CAUSES OF ACTION

A. SVS Commits Wage and Hour Violations

33. SVS classified Plaintiff as non-exempt and paid her an hourly wage throughout her employment.

34. During her employment SVS frequently required Plaintiff to work through meal periods or take them late and did not pay meal-period premiums.

35. On March 9, 2026, Ms. Moreno directed that employees were no longer to take rest periods. Plaintiff thereafter was not authorized or permitted to take compliant rest periods and did not receive rest-period premiums.

B. Defendants' Class-Wide Wage-and-Hour Policies and Practices

36. During the statutory period, Defendants classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from California's overtime requirements, and paid Plaintiff an hourly wage.

37. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours worked (including minimum wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take uninterrupted rest periods, failed to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment, and failed to furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiff. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendants was typical and illustrative.

38. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiff and the Class for all hours worked. Defendants failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the correct rate of pay and meal and rest break premium rate of pay, leading to underpayment to Plaintiff and the Class.

39. In maintaining a practice of not paying all wages owed, Defendants failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Class worked.

//

1 40. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff
2 and the Class with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants sometimes, but not always,
3 required Plaintiff and the Class to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without
4 providing timely 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five
5 hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Class for meal periods that were not
6 provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not
7 adequately inform Plaintiff and the Class of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth
8 hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work.
9 Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the
10 Class in compliance with California law.

11 41. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
12 and permit Plaintiff and the Class to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendants
13 sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff and the Class to work in excess of four consecutive
14 hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, continuous
15 and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or
16 without compensating Plaintiff and the Class for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted.
17 Defendants also did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Class of their right to take a rest
18 period. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or
19 authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff and the Class, nor did Defendants have adequate policies or
20 practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendants also did not have adequate policies or
21 practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Class were taking their required rest periods.

22 42. Further, Defendants did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods,
23 and therefore Defendants cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff and the Class took rest periods during
24 the middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not
25 authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Class to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

26 43. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
27 pay Plaintiff and the Class during and at the conclusion of their employment all wages for all
28 minimum wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages.

1 44. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and the Class
2 with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross and net
3 wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned for hours worked, correct
4 wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct
5 wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California
6 law). As a result of these violations of California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), the
7 Plaintiff and the Class suffered injury because, among other things:

8 a. the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
9 minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages to
10 which they were entitled, even though they were entitled to such wages;

11 b. the violations led them to believe that they had been paid minimum wages,
12 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages, even though they had not been;

13 c. the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum
14 wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate
15 even though they were;

16 d. the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum wages,
17 overtime, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages at the correct California
18 rate even though they had not been;

19 e. the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum,
20 meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;

21 f. in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
22 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have to perform
23 mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed to them, computations they
24 would not have to make if the wage statements contained the required accurate information; and

25 g. by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to lose
26 entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability, unemployment, and
27 other governmental benefits.

28 //

h. the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wage rates to which Plaintiff and the Class were entitled, and Plaintiff and the Class were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled. As a result, Plaintiff and the Class are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e), including actual damages.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

45. Plaintiff brings certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all other persons similarly situated, and thus, seeks class certification under California Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

46. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief authorized by California law. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

All persons who worked for any Defendant in California as a non-exempt employee at any time during the period beginning four years before the filing of the initial complaint in this action and ending when notice to the Class is sent.

47. Plaintiff is a member of the Class.

48. Plaintiff undertakes this concerted activity to improve the wages and working conditions of all Class Members.

49. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is readily ascertainable:

a. Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical. The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time, however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' records.

b. Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of

1 interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) are typical of all Class Members' claims as
2 demonstrated herein.

3 c. Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect
4 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of
5 interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no conflicts with or interests
6 antagonistic to any Class Member. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in
7 the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and
8 throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have
9 been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial
10 benefit of each class member.

11 d. Superiority: A Class Action is superior to other available methods for the
12 fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

- 13 1. The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling
14 the prosecution or defense of separate actions;
- 15 2. The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy
16 already commenced by or against members of the Class;
- 17 3. The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of
18 the claims in the particular forum; and
- 19 4. The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a
20 class action.

21 e. Public Policy Considerations: The public policy of the State of California is
22 to resolve the California Labor Code claims of many employees through a class action. Indeed,
23 current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation.
24 Former employees are also fearful of bringing actions because they believe their former employers
25 might damage their future endeavors through negative references and/or other means. Class
26 actions provide the class members who are not named in the complaint with a type of anonymity
27 that allows for the vindication of their rights at the same time as their privacy is protected.

28 //

1 50. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class (and each subclass, if
2 any) that predominate over questions affecting only individual members, including without
3 limitation, whether, as alleged herein, Defendants have:

- 4 a. failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum
5 wages, and overtime wages;
- 6 b. failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class
7 Members;
- 8 c. failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium
9 wages to Class Members;
- 10 d. failed to promptly pay all wages due to Class Members upon their discharge
11 or resignation;
- 12 e. failed to maintain accurate records of all hours Class Members worked, and
13 all meal periods Class Members took or missed;
- 14 f. failed to reimburse Class Members for all necessary business expenses; and
- 15 g. violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq. as a
16 result of their illegal conduct as described above.

17 51. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to
18 California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 because:

- 19 a. The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any
20 question affecting only individual members;
- 21 b. A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
22 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- 23 c. The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all
24 members of the class before the Court;
- 25 d. Plaintiff, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain
26 effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a class action;
- 27 e. There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable
28 relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and

injuries for which Defendants are responsible in an amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the Class for the injuries sustained;

f. Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the class would create a risk of:

1. inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or
2. adjudications with respect to the individual members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including but not limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and

g. Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to the class as a whole.

52. Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. Defendants' own business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiff would contemplate the use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as published notice, e-mail notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by other methods suitable to the Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy

(Against SVS)

53. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

54. At all times relevant hereto, SVS employed Plaintiff.

55. SVS constructively terminated Plaintiff on or about June 8, 2026.

56. Plaintiff's complaints of sexual harassment were substantial motivating reasons for her discharge.

57. As a result of SVS's conduct, Plaintiff has sustained, and continues to sustain, damages in the form of lost wages and other employment benefits, and emotional and physical distress in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdictional requirements of this court, in an amount to be proven at trial.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Sexual Harassment (Gov. Code § 12940, subd. (j))

(Against All Defendants)

58. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

59. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff was an employee of Defendants.

60. Throughout her employment, Plaintiff was subjected to sexual harassment by an SVS client, the Harasser, including unwelcome sexual advances, touching, comments, and conduct.

61. Plaintiff was subjected to this severe or pervasive conduct because she is a woman.

62. A reasonable woman in Plaintiff's circumstances would have considered the work environment to be hostile, intimidating, offensive, oppressive, and abusive.

63. Defendants are liable for the harassment perpetrated by the Harasser. SVS knew of the harassment because Plaintiff reported it, but SVS failed to take immediate and appropriate corrective action.

64. As a result of Defendants' sexual harassment, Plaintiff has sustained, and continues to sustain, damages in the form of lost wages and other employment benefits, and severe emotional and physical distress in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdictional requirements of this court, to be proven at trial.

//

//

1 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure to Prevent Harassment (Gov. Code § 12940, subd. (k))**

3 (Against SVS)

4 65. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as
5 though fully set forth herein.

6 66. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff was an employee of SVS, and SVS employed
7 five or more persons. Government Code section 12940, subdivision (k) required SVS to take all
8 reasonable steps necessary to prevent harassment and retaliation from occurring.

9 67. During the course of her employment, Plaintiff was subjected to sexual harassment
10 and retaliation as described above.

11 68. SVS failed to take all reasonable steps to prevent the harassment and retaliation
12 Plaintiff faced, and that failure was a substantial factor in causing her harm.

13 69. As a result of SVS's conduct, Plaintiff has sustained, and continues to sustain,
14 damages, including lost wages, other employment benefits, and severe emotional and physical
15 distress in an amount to be proven at trial. SVS acted for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to suffer
16 financial loss and severe emotional distress and is guilty of oppression and malice, justifying an
17 award of punitive damages. Plaintiff has and will continue to incur attorneys' fees and costs in an
18 amount according to proof.

19 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **Retaliation in Violation of FEHA (Gov. Code § 12940, subd. (h))**

21 (Against SVS)

22 70. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as
23 though fully set forth herein.

24 71. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff was an employee of SVS, and SVS employed
25 five or more persons. Government Code section 12940, subdivision (h) makes it unlawful for an
26 employer to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person because the person has
27 opposed or complained of discrimination on the basis of sex.

28 //

72. Plaintiff complained to Dulce Moreno, Stephanie Lopez, Merita Amituanai, and Darryl Noble regarding the Harasser's conduct and about SVS's failure to take corrective measures to prevent the harassment from recurring.

73. SVS retaliated against Plaintiff for these complaints by taking adverse employment actions against her, and Plaintiff's good-faith complaints were a substantial motivating factor in SVS's decision to constructively terminate her.

74. As a result of SVS's conduct, Plaintiff has sustained, and continues to sustain, damages, including lost wages, other employment benefits, and severe emotional and physical distress in an amount to be proven at trial. SVS acted for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to suffer financial loss and severe emotional distress and is guilty of oppression and malice, justifying an award of punitive damages. Plaintiff has and will continue to incur attorneys' fees and costs in an amount according to proof.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Retaliation for Reporting Sexual Harassment (Lab. Code § 1102.5)

(Against SVS)

75. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

76. Labor Code section 1102.5, subdivision (b) prohibits SVS from retaliating against an employee for disclosing information to a person with authority over the employee, or to another employee with authority to investigate, discover, or correct the violation, where the employee reasonably believes the information discloses a violation of law.

77. At all times relevant, Plaintiff was an employee of SVS and complained to SVS and its agents about ongoing sexual harassment by the Harasser and about wage and hour violations. Plaintiff had reasonable cause to believe that the Harasser and SVS committed violations of law.

78. SVS constructively terminated Plaintiff shortly after she lodged her complaints. Plaintiff's reporting of the unlawful conduct was a substantial factor in SVS's termination of her employment, in violation of Labor Code section 1102.5.

//

79. As a result, Plaintiff has sustained, and continues to sustain, damages, including lost wages, other employment benefits, and severe emotional and physical distress in an amount to be proven at trial. SVS acted for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to suffer financial loss and severe emotional distress and is guilty of oppression and malice, justifying an award of punitive damages. Plaintiff has and will continue to incur attorneys' fees and costs in an amount according to proof.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Pay Minimum Wage for All Hours Worked

(Lab. Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197 and 1197.1)

(Against All Defendants)

80. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

81. "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

82. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants knowingly failed to pay to Plaintiff and the Class compensation for all hours they worked. By their failure to pay compensation for each hour worked as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 1194 of the California Labor Code, and any additional applicable Wage Orders, which require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

83. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover minimum wages for all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

84. By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiff and the Class have been deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned by virtue of their employment with Defendants.

85. By virtue of the Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to Plaintiff and the Class for their non-overtime hours worked without pay, Plaintiff and the Class suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to Plaintiff and the Class, but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

1 86. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code section
2 1174, subdivision (d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum
3 wage compensation due Plaintiff and the Class.

4 87. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and the Class are
5 entitled to recover liquidated damages (double damages) for Defendants' failure to pay minimum
6 wages.

7 88. California Labor Code section 204 requires employers to provide employees with
8 all wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable
9 to this cause of action, Plaintiff and the Class were entitled to be paid twice a month at rates
10 required by law, including minimum wages. However, during all such times, Defendants
11 systematically failed and refused to pay Plaintiff and the Class all such wages due and failed to pay
12 those wages twice a month.

13 89. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to seek recovery of all unpaid minimum
14 wages, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code
15 sections 218.5, 218.6, and 1194, subdivision (a).

16 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **Failure to Pay Overtime Compensation (Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198)**

18 (Against All Defendants)

19 90. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth
20 fully herein.

21 91. California Labor Code section 510 provides that employees in California shall not
22 be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless
23 they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

24 92. California Labor Code sections 1194 and 1198 provide that employees in California
25 shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional
26 compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, California
27 Labor Code section 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those
28 fixed by the IWC is unlawful.

93. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and the Class have worked more than eight hours in a workday, as employees of Defendants.

94. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the maximum hours permissible by law as required by California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198. Plaintiff and the Class are regularly required to work overtime hours.

95. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional premium rate compensation to the Plaintiff and the Class for their overtime hours worked, Plaintiff and the Class have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to them but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

96. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation due to Plaintiff and the Class.

97. Plaintiff and the Class also request recovery of overtime compensation according to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, subdivision (a), as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

98. California Labor Code section 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages due and payable twice a month. IWC Wage Orders also provide that every employer shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime wages for all overtime hours worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class with all compensation due, in violation of California Labor Code section 204.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, and IWC Wage Orders)

(Against All Defendants)

99. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

1 100. At all relevant times, Defendants were aware of and were under a duty to comply
2 with California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and applicable sections of IWC Wage Orders.

3 101. California Labor Code section 512 prohibits an employer from employing an
4 employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee with
5 a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, or for a work period of more than 10 hours per day
6 without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

7 102. Section 11 of Wage Order No. 5 provides, and at all times relevant hereto provided,
8 in relevant part that:

9 No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more
10 than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes,
11 except that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will
12 complete the day's work the meal period may be waived by mutual
13 consent of the employer and employee. Unless the employee is
14 relieved of all duty during a 30-minute meal period, the meal period
15 shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time
16 worked. An "on duty" meal period shall be permitted only when the
17 nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved of all
18 duty and when by written agreement between the parties an on-the-
19 job paid meal period is agreed to. The written agreement shall state
20 that the employee may, in writing, revoke the agreement at any time.
21 If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in
22 accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the
23 employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the
24 employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the
25 meal period is not provided.

26 103. Labor Code section 226.7 prohibits any employer from requiring any employee to
27 work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable IWC wage order, and provides that
28 an employer that fails to provide an employee with a required rest break or meal period shall pay

1 that employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each
2 work day that the employer does not provide a compliant meal or rest period.

3 104. Defendants knowingly failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class with meal periods as
4 required by law. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class with any payment of
5 meal premiums. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of premium wages rate for
6 each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal break(s), plus interest thereon.

7 105. Plaintiff and the Class have therefore been damaged and are entitled to payment of
8 the meal period premiums as provided by law.

9 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **Failure to Provide Rest Periods (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, and IWC Wage Orders)**

11 (Against All Defendants)

12 106. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth
13 fully herein.

14 107. Section 12 of Wage Order No. 5 provides, and at all times relevant hereto provided,
15 in relevant part that:

16 Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest
17 periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each
18 work period. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the
19 total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time
20 per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof. However, a rest period
21 need not be authorized for employees whose total daily work time
22 is less than three and one-half (3 ½) hours. Authorized rest period
23 time shall be counted, as hours worked, for which there shall be no
24 deduction from wages. If an employer fails to provide an employee
25 a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this
26 Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at
27 the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that
28 the rest period is not provided.

108. California Labor Code section 226.7 prohibits any employer from requiring any employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable IWC wage order, and provides that an employer that fails to provide an employee with a required rest break or meal period shall pay that employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the employer does not provide a compliant meal or rest period.

109. Defendants knowingly failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class with rest periods as required by law, and knowingly failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take rest periods as required by law. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class with any payment of rest premiums. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of premium wages rate for each workday he or she was not provided with all required rest break(s), plus interest thereon.

110. Plaintiff and the Class have therefore been damaged and are entitled to payment of the rest period premiums as provided by law.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses (Lab. Code § 2802)

(Against All Defendants)

111. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

112. Defendants violated California Labor Code section 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, by failing to pay and indemnify the Plaintiff and the Class for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of Defendants.

113. As a result, Plaintiff and the Class were damaged at least in the amounts of the expenses they paid, or which were deducted by Defendants from their wages.

114. Plaintiff and the Class they represent are entitled to attorney's fees, expenses, and costs of suit pursuant to California Labor Code section 2802, subdivision (c) and interest pursuant to California Labor Code section 2802, subdivision (b).

//

1 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Waiting Time Penalties (Lab. Code §§ 201-203)**

3 (Against All Defendants)

4 115. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth
5 fully herein.

6 116. California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 require an employer to pay its
7 employees all wages due immediately upon discharge or within 72 hours of resignation. This
8 requirement applies to unpaid overtime wages. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if
9 an employer willfully fails to pay such wages, the employer must continue to pay the subject
10 employee's wages until the back wages are paid in full or an action is commenced, up to a
11 maximum of thirty days of wages.

12 117. Defendants willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class their earned and unpaid
13 wages for 30 days from the time such wages should have been paid under the Labor Code.

14 118. As a result of Defendants' willful failure to pay owed wages upon separation from
15 employment, Plaintiff and the Class have been harmed and Defendants are liable for statutory
16 waiting time penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203.

17 **TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements (Lab. Code § 226)**

19 (Against All Defendants)

20 119. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth
21 fully herein.

22 120. California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) requires employers to provide
23 employees, semi-monthly or at the time of each payment of wages, with a statement that
24 accurately reflects certain itemized information including total number of hours worked.

25 121. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to furnish Plaintiff and the Class
26 with timely and accurate wage statements that accurately reflected the total number of hours
27 worked and wages earned, as required by California Labor Code section 226.

28 //

122. As a result of Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, Plaintiff and the Class suffered actual damages and harm by being unable to determine the amount of overtime worked each pay period in a timely manner, which prevented them from asserting their rights under California law.

123. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiff and the Class is difficult and time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiff and the Class were also injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt to obtain correct wage information following Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the mandates of the California Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

124. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

125. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief, as well as an award of attorney's fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (h).

THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of Unfair Competition Law (Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*)

(Against All Defendants)

126. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

127. Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* (“UCL”) prohibits any “unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice.” Defendants have engaged in unlawful activity as follows:

a. violations of California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1198 for failure to pay minimum wages, including overtime wages;

b. violations of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 for failure to provide meal periods and rest breaks;

c. violations of California Labor Code section 226 for failure to provide accurate wage statements;

1 d. violation of California Labor Code section 2802 for failure to indemnify necessary
2 business expenses; and

3 e. violations of California Labor Code sections 201 through 203 for failure to pay
4 accrued wages upon separation of employment.

5 128. By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described
6 herein, the Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from Plaintiff, and all
7 persons similarly situated, and have deprived Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated, of
8 valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

9 129. Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result of
10 Defendants' wrongful conduct.

11 130. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, is entitled to,
12 and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property which the
13 Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiff and the Class have been deprived, by
14 means of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and
15 the Class are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful practices of
16 Defendants in order to recover restitution.

17 131. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, is further
18 entitled to and does seek a declaration that the above-described business practices are unfair,
19 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of them,
20 from engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices
21 in the future.

22 132. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, has no plain,
23 speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members suffered as
24 a consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a
25 result of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiff,
26 individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, has suffered and will continue to
27 suffer irreparable harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to
28 engage in said unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

133. Plaintiff also alleges that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other withholdings.

134. Pursuant to the UCL, Plaintiff and putative Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and Class Members; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Private Attorneys General Act (Lab. Code § 2698, *et seq.*)

(Against All Defendants)

135. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

136. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the California Labor Code of the State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

137. California Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a) specifically provides for a private right of action to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.”

138. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.3. On March 18, 2026, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to Defendants the specific provisions of the California Labor Code that Defendants violated against Plaintiff and current and former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations.

1 A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's notice to LWDA and Defendants is attached as **Exhibit B**.
2 Plaintiff's LWDA case number is LWDA-CM-1164523-26.

3 139. At the time of this filing, LWDA has not indicated that it intends to investigate
4 Defendants' Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. If it does so, Plaintiff will amend the
5 complaint. Otherwise, Plaintiff will proceed with this civil action to recover penalties under
6 California Labor Code section 2699 pursuant to section 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor
7 Code alleged herein. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under California
8 Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1197.1, and 2699, subdivision (f)(2).

9 140. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants' violation of California Labor
10 Code section 1174, subdivision (d). Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174.5, any person,
11 including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete
12 records required by California Labor Code section 1174 is subject to a penalty under section
13 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records
14 showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours
15 worked daily shall also be recorded.

16 141. Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every employer shall
17 keep total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

18 142. During the time period of employment for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees,
19 Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the California Labor Code and IWC Orders by
20 failing to maintain accurate records showing meal periods, and accurate records showing when
21 employees begin and end each work period. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records
22 required by the California Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
23 Employees of the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal
24 periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked, as stated in Defendants' records. Therefore,
25 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all
26 of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants.

27 143. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and
28 continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest

1 on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform
2 their obligations under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at
3 trial. Because of Defendants' knowing failure to comply with the California Labor Code and
4 applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury
5 in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid
6 to them.

7 144. Based on the conduct described in this complaint, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of
8 civil penalties on behalf of herself, the State of California, and similarly Aggrieved Employees of
9 Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount to be shown
10 according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted by law.

11 145. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs
12 pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (g)(1), which states, "[a]ny employee
13 who prevails in any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

14 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

15 Plaintiff, individually; on behalf of the proposed Class solely with respect to the Sixth
16 through Thirteenth Causes of Action; and as a representative of the State of California and the
17 Aggrieved Employees solely with respect to the Fourteenth Cause of Action, prays for judgment
18 against the Defendants as follows:

19 **Class Certification**

20 146. That this action be certified as a class action under California Code of Civil
21 Procedure section 382;

22 147. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class; and

23 148. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

24 **As to the First Through Fifth Causes of Action**

25 149. For economic and non-economic damages according to proof, but in an amount in
26 excess of the jurisdictional limit of this Court;

27 //

28 //

- 1 150. For punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish the Defendants and deter
2 others from engaging in similar misconduct, on those causes of action permitting
3 such relief;
4 151. For prejudgment interest;
5 152. For costs of suit, including attorneys' fees and expert witness fees, as permitted by
6 law; and
7 153. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

8 As to the Sixth Cause of Action

- 9 154. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
10 Labor Code sections 204 and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully
11 failing to pay all minimum wages due;
12 155. For general unpaid wages as may be appropriate;
13 156. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
14 such amounts were due;
15 157. For liquidated damages;
16 158. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
17 California Labor Code section 1194, subdivision (a); and,
18 159. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

19 As to the Seventh Cause of Action

- 20 160. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
21 Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully
22 failing to pay all overtime wages due;
23 161. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;
24 162. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from
25 the date such amounts were due;
26 163. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
27 California Labor Code section 1194, subdivision (a); and,
28 164. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

165. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;
166. For unpaid meal period premium wages as may be appropriate;
167. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
168. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
169. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

170. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;
171. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate;
172. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
173. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
174. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Tenth Cause of Action

175. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders;
176. For general unpaid wages and reimbursement of business expenses as may be appropriate;
177. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
178. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
179. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

//

As to the Eleventh Cause of Action

180. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment;
181. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for former employees who have left Defendants' employ;
182. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;
183. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
184. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Twelfth Cause of Action

185. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;
186. For penalties and actual damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e);
187. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (h);
188. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
189. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Thirteenth Cause of Action

190. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the UCL by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, and failing to maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;

//

- 1 191. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all Class Members and prejudgment
2 interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;
- 3 192. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all
4 funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired
5 by Defendants as a result of Defendants' violations of the UCL;
- 6 193. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
7 California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;
- 8 194. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to the UCL;
9 and
- 10 195. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

11 As to the Fourteenth Cause of Action

- 12 173. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the Labor Code
13 by failing to pay minimum wages, failing to provide meal periods, failing to
14 authorize and permit rest periods, failing to maintain accurate records of hours
15 worked and meal periods, failing to timely pay all wages to terminated employees,
16 and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;
- 17 174. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699, *et seq.*, and
18 all other applicable Labor Code provisions;
- 19 175. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to Labor
20 Code section 2699; and
- 21 176. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

22 As to All Causes of Action

- 23 196. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

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

Dated: August 14, 2026

MILLS SADAT DOWLAT LLP

By: 

Camron Dowlatshahi

Attorneys for Plaintiff Atalina Pritchard
and the Putative Class

EXHIBIT A



Civil Rights Department

651 Bannan Street, Suite 200 | Sacramento | CA | 95811
1-800-884-1684 (voice) | California's Relay Service at 711
calcivilrights.ca.gov | contact.center@calcivilrights.ca.gov

July 10, 2026

Atalina Pritchard
515 South Flower Street, Suite 1000
Los Angeles, 90071

RE: **Notice of Case Closure and Right to Sue**
CRD Matter Number: 202607-36120710
Right to Sue: Pritchard / Social Vocational Services, Inc.

Dear Atalina Pritchard:

This letter informs you that the above-referenced complaint filed with the Civil Rights Department (CRD) has been closed effective July 10, 2026 because an immediate Right to Sue notice was requested.

This letter is also your Right to Sue notice. According to Government Code section 12965, subdivision (b), a civil action may be brought under the provisions of the Fair Employment and Housing Act against the person, employer, labor organization or employment agency named in the above-referenced complaint. The civil action must be filed within one year from the date of this letter.

This matter may qualify for CRD's Small Employer Family Leave Mediation Program. Under this program, established under Government Code section 12945.21, a small employer with 5 -19 employees, charged with violation of the California Family Rights Act, Reproductive Loss Leave, or Bereavement Leave (Government Code sections 12945.2, 12945.6, or 12945.7) has the right to participate in CRD's free mediation program. Under this program both the employee requesting an immediate right to sue and the employer charged with the violation may request that all parties participate in CRD's free mediation program. The employee is required to contact the Department's Dispute Resolution Division prior to filing a civil action and must also indicate whether they are requesting mediation. The employee is prohibited from filing a civil action unless the Department does not initiate mediation within the time period specified in section 12945.21, subdivision (b) (4), or until the mediation is complete or is unsuccessful. The employee's statute of limitations to file a civil action, including for all related claims not arising under section 12945.2, is tolled from the date the employee contacts the Department regarding the intent to pursue legal action until the mediation is complete or is unsuccessful. Contact CRD's Small Employer Family Leave Mediation Pilot Program by emailing DRDOnlineRequests@calcivilrights.ca.gov and include the CRD matter number indicated on the Right to Sue notice.



Civil Rights Department

651 Bannan Street, Suite 200 | Sacramento | CA | 95811
1-800-884-1684 (voice) | California's Relay Service at 711
calcivilrights.ca.gov | contact.center@calcivilrights.ca.gov

After receiving a Right-to-Sue notice from CRD, you may have the right to file your complaint with a local government agency that enforces employment anti-discrimination laws if one exists in your area that is authorized to accept your complaint. If you decide to file with a local agency, you must file before the deadline for filing a lawsuit that is on your Right-to-Sue notice. Filing your complaint with a local agency does not prevent you from also filing a lawsuit in court.

To obtain a federal Right to Sue notice, you must contact the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to file a complaint within 30 days of receipt of this CRD Notice of Case Closure or within 300 days of the alleged discriminatory act, whichever is earlier.

Sincerely,

Civil Rights Department

EXHIBIT B



333 South Hope Street
40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
www.msdlawyers.com

Camron Dowlatshahi
O: (213) 628 3856
D: (213) 279-2612
E: camron@msdlawyers.com

March 18, 2026

**VIA ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION TO LWDA;
VIA CERTIFIED MAIL TO EMPLOYER**

California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Social Vocational Services, Inc.
3555 Torrance Blvd
Torrance, CA 90503

Re: Notice of Claim Under Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA")

Dear LWDA:

My office has been retained by Atalina Pritchard ("Plaintiff") to pursue a PAGA representative action (Lab. Code § 2699, *et seq.*) against Social Vocational Services, Inc. ("Defendant"). This letter shall serve as notice, and a request pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, that the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") investigate the violations by Defendant described herein against Plaintiff and against other current and/or former employees ("Aggrieved Employees"). If LWDA does not intend to investigate the violations described herein, we respectfully request that the agency specifically notify our office of the same at your earliest possible opportunity.

Plaintiff's Employment with Defendant

Defendant owns/owned and operates/operated an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California. Defendant is therefore subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC"), and the California Business and Professions Code.

Plaintiff is a resident of Santa Clara, California who works for Defendant in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee since approximately September 08, 2025. Plaintiff regularly worked more than eight hours in a workday and/or more than 40 hours in a workweek.

Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendant failed to pay for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with legally compliant meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take rest periods, failed to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff when Defendant terminated Plaintiff's employment, failed to furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, and failed to indemnify Plaintiff for expenditures. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendant was typical and

illustrative.

**Defendant Failed to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Minimum,
Straight Time, and Overtime Wages**

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. “Hours worked” is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

In addition, Labor Code section 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday or 40 hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Labor Code sections 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code section 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the IWC is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Defendant required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work “off-the clock,” uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work during unpaid meal periods and after clocking out for the workday. Some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Defendant also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant used a system of time rounding and/or synthetic timekeeping that resulted, over a period of time, in failing to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees properly for all the time they have actually worked, even though the realities of Defendant operations are such that it is possible, practical, and feasible to count and pay for work time to the minute. Accordingly, Defendant frequently paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees less than all their work time. Some of this unpaid work also should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code sections 210, 1197.1, and 2699, subdivision (t)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (*i.e.*, more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee’s work time is six hours and ten minutes, the

employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant has wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted.

Instead, Defendant continued to assert control over Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods, or by denying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a rest period. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code sections 210 and 2699, subdivision (f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

Based on its failure to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Defendant also violated Labor Code section 204.

Labor Code section 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for overtime hours worked. However, during all such times, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wage for all hours worked. As a result, Defendant owes employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code section 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d). Under Labor Code section 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by Labor Code section 1174 is subject to a penalty under section 1174.5. Pursuant to IWC Wage Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Order deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendant's records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendant. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendant's knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned; (2) total hours worked by the employee; (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis; (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item; (5) net wages earned; (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number; (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226, subd. (e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides that “[a]n employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.” (Lab. Code § 226, subd. (e)(1).)

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant or failed to furnish Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law).

Because Defendant violated Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights. Accordingly, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendant’s failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000) per employee.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Expenditures

Labor Code section 2802, subdivision (a) provides that employers shall indemnify employees for all necessary business expenditures or losses that have been incurred by the employees in direct discharge of their duties. Throughout the statutory period applicable to this cause of action, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendant. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees regularly paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses, including, without limitation, work-related equipment, work attire, and use of personal cellular phones. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, but Defendant or failed to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code sections 2802 and 2699, subdivision (f)(2) for failing to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenditures.

Statement of Specific Provisions of the Labor Code Violated

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

- (1) Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages;
- (2) Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
- (3) Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
- (4) Labor Code section 204 by failing to pay all earned wages twice per month;
- (5) Labor Code section 1174.5 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
- (6) Labor Code section 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
- (7) Labor Code section 2802 by failing to indemnify for necessary expenditures.

Pursuant to PAGA, Plaintiff seeks civil penalties arising from these violations. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699, subdivision (f)(2).

This letter shall serve as Plaintiff's notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3 and we ask that LWDA conduct an investigation concerning the violations described herein. Alternatively, if LWDA does not intend to investigate these violations, we ask that it issue a notification letter to our office confirming the same so that we may proceed with our civil action asserting the PAGA claims described herein.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or if you would like to discuss this matter further. Nothing in this letter is intended to be, or should be construed as, an admission against the interests of Plaintiff or other current or former employees of Defendant and shall not be construed as a waiver of their rights, remedies, claims, or defenses, all of which are expressly reserved.

Sincerely,



Camron Dowlathahi