

1 Fawn F. Bekam (SBN 307312)
2 fawn@abramsonlabor.com
3 Andrew Sandoval (SBN 346996)
4 andrew.s@abramsonlabor.com
5 Refugio Ortega-Carrillo (SBN 346933)
6 refugio@abramsonlabor.com
7 **ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP**
8 1700 W Burbank Blvd
9 Burbank, CA 91506
10 Telephone: (213) 493-6300
11 Facsimile: (213) 336-3704

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff Glen Bruno, individually, and
13 on behalf of all other aggrieved employees

14 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
15 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

16 GLEN BRUNO, individually, and on behalf of
17 all other aggrieved employees,

18 Plaintiff,

19 v.

20 CORESITE, L.L.C.; and DOES 1 through 50,
21 inclusive,

22 Defendants.

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
5/14/2026 2:20 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By Y. Ayala, Deputy Clerk

Case No.: **26STCV15439**

**REPRESENTATIVE COMPLAINT FOR
ENFORCEMENT OF THE PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004,
LABOR CODE §§ 2698, ET SEQ.:**

1 Plaintiff Glen Bruno (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all other aggrieved
2 employees, alleges as follows:

3 INTRODUCTION

4 1. Plaintiff brings this representative action against defendants CoreSite, L.L.C. and
5 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive (collectively, “Defendants”), on Plaintiff’s own behalf and on behalf
6 of all other non-exempt or hourly-paid employees currently or formerly employed by Defendants
7 in California at any time from March 9, 2025 to the present (“aggrieved employees”).

8 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants have
9 violated state wage and hour laws by, among other things:

- 10 (a) failing to pay all minimum, overtime, and sick wages;
- 11 (b) failing to provide meal periods or pay meal period premiums;
- 12 (c) failing to authorize or permit rest periods or pay rest period premiums;
- 13 (d) failing to reimburse necessary expenditures;
- 14 (e) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements;
- 15 (f) retaliating in response to the use of or requests to use sick leave; and
- 16 (g) failing to pay all wages due during employment and upon separation of
17 employment.

18 3. Plaintiff seeks monetary relief against Defendants on behalf of himself and all other
19 aggrieved employees to recover, among other things, unpaid wages, statutory penalties, unlawfully
20 deducted wages, benefits, interest, attorneys’ fees, costs and expenses, and penalties pursuant to
21 Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 233, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5,
22 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2698, *et seq.*, 2802, and Code of California Civil
23 Procedure § 1021.5.

24 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

25 4. The penalties and other legal and equitable relief sought by Plaintiff exceed the
26 minimal jurisdictional limits of this Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

27 5. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Article VI, § 10 of the
28 California Constitution, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all other causes”

1 except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not
2 specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

3 6. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and
4 belief, Defendants are citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California,
5 and/or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise
6 of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play
7 and substantial justice.

8 7. Venue is proper in this court because Defendants maintain offices, have agents,
9 employ individuals, and/or transact business in this county.

10 **THE PARTIES**

11 8. Plaintiff is a California citizen and was employed by Defendants in Los Angeles,
12 California as a non-exempt support specialist from approximately October 2022 to approximately
13 August 2025.

14 9. Defendants were and are subject to the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders as
15 employers whose employees were and are engaged to work throughout this county and the State
16 of California.

17 10. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names or capacities of the Defendant sued herein
18 under the fictitious names DOES 1 through 50 but will amend the complaint and serve such
19 fictitiously named Defendants once their names and capacities become known.

20 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each and all of the acts
21 and omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable, to each Defendant acting as
22 the agent, employee, alter ego, and/or joint venturer of, or working in concert with, each of the
23 other co-Defendants and within the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture,
24 or concerted activity with legal authority to act on the others' behalf.

25 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that during the relevant time
26 period, DOES 1 through 50 were the employers of Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees
27 within the meaning of all applicable state laws and statutes. Plaintiff is informed and believes and
28 thereon alleges that DOES 1 through 50 directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working

1 conditions, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff and the other aggrieved
2 employees so as to make each Defendant an employer liable under the statutory provision set forth
3 herein.

4 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that DOES 1 through 50 had
5 the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees, to set work rules
6 and conditions governing Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees' employment, and to
7 supervise their daily employment activities.

8 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that DOES 1 through 50
9 exercise sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's and the other aggrieved
10 employees' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and the other aggrieved
11 employees.

12 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

13 15. During the relevant time period, Defendants employed Plaintiff and aggrieved
14 employees as non-exempt employees throughout California at Defendants' California business
15 location(s).

16 16. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and aggrieved
17 employees were entitled to compensation for all hours worked. However, Defendants failed to pay
18 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees at least the minimum wage, overtime wage, and sick wage due
19 to Defendants' policy and practice of failing to pay all wages owed at the correct rate. Specifically,
20 Defendants failed to correctly calculate the regular rate of pay when Plaintiff and Other aggrieved
21 employees earned overtime or used sick pay and earned shift differentials. For example, during the
22 workweek of July 5, 2025 to July 11, 2025, Plaintiff's regular rate of pay was \$38.3002. The
23 minimum overtime rate at which Defendants were required to pay Plaintiff overtime wages was
24 therefore \$57.4503. However, Defendants paid Plaintiff an overtime rate of \$55.4528 for this
25 workweek. Further, during the pay period of August 2, 2025 to August 15, 2025, Plaintiff used 8
26 hours of sick time. Defendants paid Plaintiff sick time at his base hourly rate rather than his higher
27 regular rate of pay.. As a result, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for all
28 minimum and regular wages in violation of the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order.

1 17. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and aggrieved
2 employees were entitled to receive 30-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for every 5
3 hours worked or payment of meal period premiums at their regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.
4 However, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and aggrieved employees with 30-minute,
5 uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for every 5 hours worked and failed to pay meal period
6 premiums at their regular rate of pay in lieu thereof in violation of the Labor Code and applicable
7 IWC Wage Order. Specifically, when Defendants paid Plaintiff and Other aggrieved employees
8 meal period premiums, they did so at Plaintiff's and Other aggrieved employees' base hourly rate
9 rather than their regular rate of pay.

10 18. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and aggrieved
11 employees were entitled to receive 10-minute, duty-free rest periods for every 4 hours worked or
12 major fraction thereof or payment of rest period premiums at their regular rate of pay in lieu
13 thereof. However, Defendants failed to permit Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to take 10-
14 minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods for every 4 hours worked or major fraction thereof
15 and failed to pay rest period premiums at their regular rate of pay in lieu thereof in violation of the
16 Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order. Specifically, when Defendants paid Plaintiff and
17 Other aggrieved employees rest period premiums, they did so at Plaintiff's and Other aggrieved
18 employees' base hourly rate rather than their regular rate of pay.

19 19. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and Other aggrieved
20 employees were entitled to indemnification of all necessary expenditures or losses incurred in
21 direct consequence of the discharge of Plaintiff and Other aggrieved employees' duties. However,
22 Defendants made it necessary for Plaintiff and Other aggrieved employees to use their personal
23 devices to complete multifactor authentication, and Defendants failed to indemnify for these
24 necessary expenditures in violation of the Labor Code.

25 20. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and aggrieved
26 employees were entitled to itemized wage statements that accurately showed, *inter alia*, gross
27 wages earned, total hours worked, net wages earned, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during
28 the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

1 21. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and aggrieved
2 employees were entitled to timely payment of wages due during employment and upon separation
3 of employment. In violation of the Labor Code, Plaintiff and aggrieved employees did not receive
4 payment of all wages within the required time periods.

5 22. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew they had a duty to compensate
6 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees, and Defendants had the financial ability to pay such
7 compensation but willfully, knowingly, and/or intentionally failed to do so in order to increase
8 Defendants' profits.

9 23. Therefore, Plaintiff brings this lawsuit against Defendants on Plaintiff's own behalf
10 and on behalf of all aggrieved employees to recover, among other things, attorneys' fees, civil
11 penalties, costs, and expenses.

12 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **ENFORCEMENT OF LABOR CODE §§ 2698, *ET SEQ.***

14 (Public Attorneys General Act of 2004)

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

17 25. Labor Code § 2699(a) provides that notwithstanding any other provision of law, any
18 provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor
19 and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
20 agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a
21 civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or
22 former employees against whom a violation of the same code provision was committed pursuant
23 to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.

24 26. Labor Code § 2699(m) provides that civil penalties recovered by aggrieved
25 employees shall be distributed as follows: 65% to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency
26 for enforcement of labor laws, including the administration of this part, and for education of
27 employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities under this code, to be continuously
28 appropriated to supplement and not supplant the funding to the agency for those purposes; and

35% to the aggrieved employees.

27. Plaintiff and all other non-exempt or hourly-paid employees currently or formerly employed by Defendants in California at any time from March 9, 2025 to the present are “aggrieved employees” as defined in Labor Code § 2699(c).

28. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, violates numerous Labor Code sections, including the following:

- (a) Failing to pay minimum, overtime, and sick wages to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees at the correct rate in violation of Labor Code §§ 246, 510, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198;
- (b) Failing to provide compliant meal periods without paying Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees meal period premiums for each day that lawful meal periods were not provided in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;
- (c) Failing to authorize and permit compliant rest breaks without paying Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees rest period premiums for each day that lawful rest periods were not authorized or permitted in violation of Labor Code § 226.7;
- (d) Failing to reimburse all necessary expenditures in violation of Labor Code § 2802;
- (e) Retaliating against Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for using or attempting to use sick leave in violation of Labor Code § 233;
- (f) Failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226;
- (g) Failing to timely pay all wages due during Plaintiff’s and other aggrieved employees’ employment and at the end of their employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, and 210; and
- (h) Failing to maintain accurate and complete records showing the hours worked each day by Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5.

29. Plaintiff personally suffered each of the Labor Code violations alleged in this lawsuit within the one-year period prior to his PAGA notice.

30. Plaintiff has exhausted the administrative requirements provided in Labor Code § 2699.3 as to Defendants and is therefore able to pursue a claim for penalties on Plaintiff's own behalf and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees under PAGA.

31. Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2699, 2699.3, and 2699.5 for the Labor Code violations alleged herein.

32. Plaintiff is entitled to recover attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 218.5, and 2699(k)(1).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

On Plaintiff's own behalf and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. For civil penalties pursuant to PAGA;
2. For injunctive relief;
3. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit and interest, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 218.5, 233, 248.5, and 2699(k)(1); and
4. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: May 14, 2026

ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP

By: 
Fawn F. Bekam
Andrew Sandoval
Refugio Ortega-Carrillo
Attorneys for Plaintiff Glen Bruno