

Fawn F. Bekam (SBN 307312)
fawn@abramsonlabor.com
ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP
1700 W. Burbank Blvd.
Burbank, CA 91506
Telephone: (213) 493-6300
Facsimile: (213) 336-3704

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
6/22/2026 9:52 AM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By C. Manzo, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff Jonathan Montes, individually, and
on behalf of all other aggrieved employees

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

JONATHAN MONTES, individually, and on
behalf of all other aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

v.

TAITRON COMPONENTS INCORPORATED;
and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **26CHCV02496**

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

1 Plaintiff Jonathan Montes (“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 Taitron Components
5 Incorporated and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive (collectively, “Defendants”), on Plaintiff’s own
6 behalf and on behalf of all other non-exempt employees currently or formerly employed by
7 Defendants in California at any time from April 17, 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 and overtime 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 provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
- 14 (e) failing to pay all wages due during employment and upon separation of
15 employment.

16 3. Plaintiff seeks monetary relief against Defendants on behalf of himself and all other
17 aggrieved employees to recover, among other things, attorneys’ fees, costs and expenses, and civil
18 penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174,
19 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2698, *et seq.*

20 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

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

23 5. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Article VI, § 10 of the
24 California Constitution, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all other causes”
25 except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not
26 specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

27 6. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and
28 belief, Defendants are citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California,

1 and/or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise
2 of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play
3 and substantial justice.

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

6 **THE PARTIES**

7 8. Plaintiff is a California citizen and was employed by Defendants in Valencia,
8 California as a non-exempt shipper from approximately May 2022 to approximately July 2025.

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

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

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

20 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that during the relevant time
21 period, DOES 1 through 50 were the employers of Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees
22 within the meaning of all applicable state laws and statutes. Plaintiff is informed and believes and
23 thereon alleges that DOES 1 through 50 directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working
24 conditions, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff and the other aggrieved
25 employees so as to make each Defendant an employer liable under the statutory provision set forth
26 herein.

27 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that DOES 1 through 50 had
28 the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees, to set work rules

1 and conditions governing Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees' employment, and to
2 supervise their daily employment activities.

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

7 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

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

11 16. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and aggrieved
12 employees were entitled to compensation for all hours worked. However, Defendants failed to pay
13 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees at least the legal minimum and overtime wage for all hours
14 worked due to Defendants' policy and practice of enforcing unrealistic work expectations which
15 forced Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees to work off the clock. As a result, Defendants failed
16 to pay Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for all minimum and regular wages in violation of the
17 Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order.

18 17. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and aggrieved
19 employees were entitled to receive 30-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for every 5
20 hours worked or payment of meal period premiums at their regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.
21 However, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and aggrieved employees with 30-minute,
22 uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for every 5 hours worked and failed to pay meal period
23 premiums at their regular rate of pay in lieu thereof in violation of the Labor Code and applicable
24 IWC Wage Order.

25 18. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and aggrieved
26 employees were entitled to receive 10-minute, duty-free rest periods for every 4 hours worked or
27 major fraction thereof or payment of rest period premiums at their regular rate of pay in lieu
28 thereof. However, Defendants failed to permit Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to take 10-

1 minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods for every 4 hours worked or major fraction thereof
2 and failed to pay rest period premiums at their regular rate of pay in lieu thereof in violation of the
3 Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order.

4 19. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and aggrieved
5 employees were entitled to reimburse for necessary expenditures. However, Defendants made it
6 necessary for Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to use their personal devices to clock in and out
7 on a mobile application, and Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for
8 these expenses in violation of the Labor Code.

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

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

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

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

24 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

26 (Private Attorneys General Act of 2004)

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

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

8 26. Labor Code § 2699(m) provides that civil penalties recovered by aggrieved
9 employees shall be distributed as follows: 65% to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency
10 for enforcement of labor laws, including the administration of this part, and for education of
11 employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities under this code, to be continuously
12 appropriated to supplement and not supplant the funding to the agency for those purposes; and
13 35% to the aggrieved employees.

14 27. Plaintiff and all other non-exempt employees currently or formerly employed by
15 Defendants in California at any time from April 17, 2025 to the present are “aggrieved employees”
16 as defined in Labor Code § 2699(c).

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

- 19 (a) Failing to pay minimum and overtime wages to Plaintiff and other aggrieved
20 employees at the correct rate in violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 558,
21 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198;
- 22 (b) Failing to provide compliant meal periods without paying Plaintiff and other
23 aggrieved employees meal period premiums for each day that lawful meal
24 periods were not provided in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;
- 25 (c) Failing to authorize and permit compliant rest breaks without paying
26 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees rest period premiums for each day
27 that lawful rest periods were not authorized or permitted in violation of
28 Labor Code § 226.7;

- 1 (d) Failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements in violation of Labor
2 Code § 226;
- 3 (e) Failing to timely pay all wages due during Plaintiff's and other aggrieved
4 employees' employment and at the end of their employment in violation of
5 Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, and 210; and
- 6 (f) Failing to maintain accurate and complete records showing the hours worked
7 each day by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor
8 Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5.

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

11 30. Plaintiff has exhausted the administrative requirements provided in Labor Code §
12 2699.3 as to Defendants and is therefore able to pursue a claim for penalties on Plaintiff's own
13 behalf and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees under PAGA.

14 31. Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 558,
15 1174.5, 1197.1, 2699, 2699.3, and 2699.5 for the Labor Code violations alleged herein.

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

18 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

- 21 1. For civil penalties pursuant to PAGA;
- 22 2. For injunctive relief;
- 23 3. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit and interest, pursuant to Labor Code
24 §§ 210, 218.5, and 2699(k)(1); and

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 4. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

2
3 Dated: June 22, 2026

ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP

4
5 By: 

6 Fawn F. Bekam
7 Attorneys for Plaintiff Jonathan Montes