

Justin F. Marquez (SBN 262417)
justin@wilshirelawfirm.com
 Christina M. Le (SBN 237697)
cle@wilshirelawfirm.com
 Erik A. Dos Santos (SBN 309998)
edsantos@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
 3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor
 Los Angeles, California 90010
 Telephone: (213) 381-9988
 Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff

FILED
 Superior Court of California
 County of Los Angeles

02/29/2024

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: M. Concepcion Deputy

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

DEAN LEDUC, individually, and on behalf of
 all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

SULLY INSURANCE CENTER, LLC DBA
 LACARGUY, a California limited liability
 company; SOUTH BAY MOTORS, LLC DBA
 PORSCHE SOUTH BAY, a California limited
 liability company; GENSM, LLC DBA
 GENESIS SANTA MONICA, a California
 limited liability company; and DOES 1 through
 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 23STCV23411

**SECOND AMENDED CLASS AND
 REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
 COMPLAINT:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197);
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198);
3. Failure to Pay All Commissions (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 200, et seq.)
4. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512);
5. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7);
6. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203);
7. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements (Cal. Lab. Code § 226);
8. Unfair Business Practices (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.); and
9. Civil Penalties Under PAGA (Cal. Lab. Code § 2699, et seq.)

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff DEAN LEDUC (“Plaintiff”), based upon facts that either have evidentiary support
2 or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation
3 and discovery, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendant SULLY INSURANCE CENTER,
6 LLC DBA LACARGUY, SOUTH BAY MOTORS, LLC DBA PORSCHE SOUTH BAY,
7 GENSM, LLC DBA GENESIS SANTA MONICA, and DOES 1 through 10 (hereinafter
8 collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor Code violations and unfair business
9 practices stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time,
10 and overtime wages), failure to pay all commissions, failure to provide meal periods, failure to
11 authorize and permit rest periods, failure to timely pay final wages, and failure to furnish accurate
12 wage statements.

13 2. Plaintiff brings the First through Eighth Causes of Action individually and as a class
14 action on behalf of himself and certain current and former employees of Defendants (hereinafter
15 collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members,” and defined more fully below). The
16 Class consists of Plaintiff and all other persons who have been employed by any Defendant in
17 California as a salesperson or sales representative and paid a commission during the statute of
18 limitations period applicable to the claims pleaded here.

19 3. Plaintiff brings the Ninth Cause of Action as a representative action under the
20 California Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties that are owed to
21 Plaintiff, the State of California, and past and present non-exempt employees by Defendants in the
22 State of California during the statute of limitations period for his PAGA claim (hereinafter referred
23 to as the “Aggrieved Employees”).

24 4. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
25 establishment within the State of California. As such, and based upon all the facts and
26 circumstances incident to Defendants’ business in California, Defendants are subject to the
27 California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”), and
28 the California Business & Professions Code.

1 5. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained
2 a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 3 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum,
4 straight time, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor
5 Code and IWC Wage Orders;
6 (b) Failing to pay all commissions owed;
7 (c) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in
8 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing
9 to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and failing
10 to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period violation
11 occurred;
12 (d) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
13 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
14 Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a rest
15 period violation occurred;
16 (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum, straight time, overtime,
17 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages due within the time
18 period specified by California law when employment terminates; and
19 (f) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements
20 containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and
21 IWC Wage Orders

22 6. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and
23 constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their
24 unlawful policies. Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were
25 willful and deliberate.

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

1 responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of
2 “respondeat superior.”

3 **THE PARTIES**

4 **A. Plaintiff**

5 8. Plaintiff DEAN LEDUC is a resident of California who worked for Defendants in
6 Los Angeles County, California from approximately June 2021 to December 2022, during which
7 he worked as a sales representative and was paid commissions.

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

11 **B. Defendants**

12 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
13 alleges, that Defendants SULLY INSURANCE CENTER, LLC DBA LACARGUY, SOUTH
14 BAY MOTORS, LLC DBA PORSCHE SOUTH BAY, GENSM, LLC DBA GENESIS SANTA
15 MONICA are, and at all times herein mentioned, were:

- 16 (a) A business entity qualified to do business and actually conducting business
17 in numerous counties throughout the State of California; and,
18 (b) The former employer of Plaintiff and the current and/or former employer of
19 the putative Class because Defendants SULLY INSURANCE CENTER,
20 LLC DBA LACARGUY, SOUTH BAY MOTORS, LLC DBA PORSCHE
21 SOUTH BAY, GENSM, LLC DBA GENESIS SANTA MONICA suffered
22 and permitted Plaintiff and the Class to work, and/or controlled their wages,
23 hours, or working conditions.

24 11. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued
25 herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each
26 of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by
27 Plaintiff and the Class as alleged herein. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to set forth the true
28 names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained, together with

appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

12. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or injured a significant number of the Plaintiff and the Class in the State of California.

13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon 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 thereon 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.

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

14. Plaintiff worked for Defendants in California as a commissioned salesperson employee from approximately June 2021 to approximately December 2022 during which he worked as a sales representative and was paid commissions.

15. Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failed to pay all commissions owed, 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 Defendants terminated his employment, and failed to furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiff. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendants was typical and illustrative.

16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not

1 paying Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum,
2 straight time, and overtime wages. Defendants required Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved
3 Employees to work “off-the-clock”, uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Plaintiff, the Class
4 and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work before clocking in, after clocking out, and during
5 meal periods. Some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to
6 pay for all hours worked, Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff,
7 the Class and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

8 17. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully failed to include non-
9 discretionary bonuses, commissions, incentive pay, production pay, performance pay, and/or shift
10 differentials in the calculation of Plaintiff’s, the Class Members’ and the Aggrieved Employees’
11 regular rate of pay used to calculate their overtime rate for the payment of overtime wages.
12 Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved Employees earned non-discretionary bonuses, commissions,
13 incentive pay, production pay, performance pay, and/or shift differentials and overtime wages in
14 the same pay periods where they worked overtime hours. Accordingly, Defendants failed to
15 compensate Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime compensation they
16 were owed.

17 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff, the Class and the
18 Aggrieved Employees all commissions owed.

19 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff,
20 the Class and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants
21 regularly, but not always, required Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved Employees to work in
22 excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free
23 meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff, the Class and the
24 Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work
25 or tenth hour of work. Instead, Defendants continued to assert control over Plaintiff, the Class and
26 the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks
27 which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory meal periods, or by
28 denying Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a meal period.

1 Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was not to provide meal periods to Plaintiff, the
2 Class and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

3 20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
4 and permit Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest periods.
5 Defendants regularly required Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess
6 of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-
7 minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four
8 hours), or without compensating Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods
9 that were not authorized or permitted. Instead, Defendants continued to assert control over
10 Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to
11 perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory
12 rest periods, or by denying Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a
13 rest period. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiff,
14 the Class and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

15 21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
16 pay Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved Employees all final wages due at their termination of
17 employment. In addition, Plaintiff's final paychecks did not include payment for all expenditures,
18 minimum wages, straight time wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest
19 period premium wages owed to him by Defendants at the conclusion of his employment. On
20 information and belief, Defendants' failure to timely pay Plaintiff's final wages when his
21 employment terminated was not a single, isolated incident, but was instead consistent with
22 Defendants' policy and practice that applied to Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved Employees .

23 22. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff, the Class
24 and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable
25 hourly rates, all overtime hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours
26 worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law,
27 and correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance
28 with California law). As a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the

1 Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

- 2 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
3 minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period
4 premium wages, even though they were entitled;
- 5 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum,
6 straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium
7 wages, even though they had not been;
- 8 (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum,
9 straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium
10 wages at the correct California rate even though they were entitled;
- 11 (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, straight time,
12 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the
13 correct California rate even though they had not been;
- 14 (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum,
15 straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium
16 wages owed to them;
- 17 (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
18 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have
19 to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages
20 owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage
21 statements contained the required accurate information;
- 22 (g) by understating the wages truly due to them, the violations caused them to
23 lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security,
24 disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;
- 25 (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wage
26 rates to which Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved Employees were
27 entitled, and Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved Employees were paid less
28 than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

Thus, Plaintiff, the Class and the Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code § 226(e) and injunctive relief under California Labor Code § 226(h).

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

23. 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 § 382.

24. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief authorized by California law.

25. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

All persons who worked for any Defendant in California as a salesperson or sales representative and paid a commission 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.¹

26. At all material times, Plaintiff was a member of the Class.

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

28. 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 forty (40) 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 interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any)

¹ In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Judicial Council of California adopted Emergency Rule 9(a) (California Rules of Court), whereby "statutes of limitations and repose for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are tolled from April 6, 2020 to October 1, 2020."

are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.

(c) Adequacy: 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 interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class Member. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

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

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

(e) Public Policy Considerations: The public policy of the State of California is to resolve the California Labor Code claims of many employees through a class action. Indeed, current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are also fearful of bringing actions because they believe their former employers might damage their future endeavors through negative references and/or other means. Class actions provide the class members who are not named in the

complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights at the same time as their privacy is protected.

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

- (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages;
- (b) Failed to include non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, monetary and non-monetary incentives, production pay, performance pay, and/or shift differentials in the calculation of the Class Members' regular rate of pay used to calculate the overtime rate for the payment of overtime wages;
- (c) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class Members;
- (d) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages to Class Members;
- (e) Failed to provide Class Members with timely final wages;
- (f) Failed to provide Class Members with accurate wage statements; and
- (g) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et. seq.* as a result of their illegal conduct as described above.

30. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because:

- (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any question affecting only individual members;
- (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the class before the Court;
- (d) Plaintiff, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain

effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a class action;

(e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable 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.

31. 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. The 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 contemplates 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

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages for All Hours Worked)

32. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 31 in this Complaint.

33. “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.

34. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants knowingly failed to pay 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 California Labor Code § 1194, and any additional applicable Wage Orders, which require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

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

36. 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.

37. 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 and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

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

39. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194.2, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover liquidated damages (double damages) for Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wages.

40. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to

1 this cause of action, Plaintiff and the Class were entitled to be paid twice a month at rates required
2 by law, including minimum and straight time wages. However, during all such times, Defendants
3 systematically failed and refused to pay Plaintiff and the Class all such wages due and failed to
4 pay those wages twice a month.

5 41. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to seek recovery of all unpaid minimum and
6 straight time wages, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor
7 Code §§ 218.5, 218.6, and 1194(a).

8 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)**

10 42. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
11 1 through 41 in this Complaint.

12 43. California Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be
13 employed more than eight hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they
14 receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

15 44. California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 provide that employees in California shall
16 not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional
17 compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, California
18 Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed
19 by the IWC is unlawful.

20 45. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and the Class have worked more than eight
21 hours in a workday and/or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, as employees of Defendants.

22 46. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class
23 overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the maximum hours
24 permissible by law as required by California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198.

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

1 according to proof at trial.

2 48. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to include non-discretionary bonuses,
3 commissions, monetary and non-monetary incentives, production pay, performance pay, and/or
4 shift differentials in the calculation of Plaintiff's and the other Class Members' regular rate of pay
5 used to calculate the overtime rate for the payment of overtime wages.

6 49. By failing to keep adequate time records required by Labor Code § 1174(d),
7 Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation due to
8 Plaintiff and the Class.

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

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

18 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **(Against All Defendants for Pay All Commissions Owed)**

20 52. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
21 1 through 51 in this Complaint.

22 53. Labor Code section 204.1 provides that commission in wages are compensation paid
23 to any person for services rendered in the sale of such employer's property or services and based
24 proportionally upon the amount or value thereof.

25 54. At all times relevant to this complaint and during Plaintiff and the Class's tenure
26 with Defendants, a portion of Plaintiff's total compensation as employees of Defendants included
27 commissions earned by closing sales deals.

28 55. Plaintiff and the Class and Defendants agreed, in writing, that in addition to base

1 pay Plaintiff and the Class would earn commissions on sales closed. The commission plants
2 entitled Plaintiff and the Class to a percentage of each sale.

3 56. Plaintiff and the Class performed all duties and obligations required of them during
4 their employment, including those duties and obligations that would entitle Plaintiff and the Class
5 to commission under the applicable commission plans.

6 57. Defendants, and each of them knowingly, intentionally, and willfully refused and
7 failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class the full and complete amount of commissions earned during
8 employment, causing Plaintiff harm. Plaintiff is entitled to these commissions, as wages.

9 58. Pursuant to Labor Code section 218.5, Plaintiff and the Class requests that the Court
10 award reasonable attorney's fees incurred, and under Labor Code section 218.6, all interest on all
11 due and unpaid wages, in the form of commission, at the legal rate specified by California Civil
12 Code section 3289, subdivision (b), accruing from the date the wages were due and payable.

13 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)**

15 59. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
16 1 through 58 in this Complaint.

17 60. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the
18 Plaintiff and the Class of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than the
19 start of Plaintiff's and the Class' sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal
20 periods no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. California Labor Code
21 § 512, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an employer provide unpaid meal
22 periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a violation of
23 California Labor Code § 226.7 for an employer to require any employee to work during any meal
24 period mandated under any Wage Order.

25 61. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiff
26 and the Class with both meal periods as required by California law. By their failure to permit and
27 authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take all meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that
28 Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods),

Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable Wage Orders.

62. Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s), plus interest thereon.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods)

63. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein in paragraphs 1 through 62 in this Complaint.

64. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of ten uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). California Labor Code § 512, the applicable Wage Orders require that the employer permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of ten minutes each for each 4-hour period worked. 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 so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest period mandated under any Wage Order.

65. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked more than four hours in a workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take rest periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable Wage Orders.

66. Under California law, 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.

//

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees – Waiting Time Penalties)

67. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 66 in this Complaint.

68. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

69. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of many other members of the Class ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and continue to fail to pay terminated Class Members, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

70. Defendants' failure to pay those Class members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

71. California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with §§ 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

72. The Class is entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to thirty (30) days maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

73. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, the Class is also entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs incurred in this action.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and Compliant Wage Records)

74. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 73 in this Complaint.

75. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(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.

76. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify the gross wages earned by Plaintiff and the Class, the failure to list the true "total hours worked by the employee," and the failure to list the true net wages earned.

77. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

78. Specifically, Plaintiff and the members of the Class have been injured by Defendants' intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage

statements under California Labor Code § 226(a).

79. 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 California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

80. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000) per employee.

81. 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 § 226(h).

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)

82. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 81 in this Complaint.

83. Defendants, and each of them, are "persons" as defined under California Business & Professions Code § 17201.

84. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Class members, and to the general public. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

85. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

86. A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as violations

of, among other things, the California Labor Code, are unlawful and in violation of public policy; and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive, fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages

87. Defendants' failure to pay minimum and straight time wages, and other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Pay Overtime Wages

88. Defendants' failure to pay overtime compensation and other benefits in violation of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Provide All Commissions Owed

89. Defendants' failure to provide all commissions owed in accordance with California Labor Code §§ 200, *et seq.*

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

90. Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

91. Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with California Labor Code § 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

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

93. Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result of

Defendants' wrongful conduct.

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

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

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

97. 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.

98. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiff and putative Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences four years and 178 days 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 § 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of
2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 *et seq.*)**

99. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 98 in this Complaint.

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

101. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “Notwithstanding 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.”

102. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3.

103. On October 30, 2023 Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendant Sully Insurance Center, LLC of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendant violated against Plaintiff and current and former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiff also paid the filing fee.

104. On December 15, 2023 Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants violated against Plaintiff and current and former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiff also paid the filing fee.

105. The LWDA has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’ Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under

California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699.

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

107. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated only with respect to the class claims, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

Class Certification

1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action;
2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class; and,
3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

As to the First Cause of Action

4. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 204 and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all minimum and straight time wages due;
5. For unpaid wages as may be appropriate;
6. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
7. For liquidated damages;
8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,
9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Second Cause of Action

10. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due;

11. For unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;

12. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

13. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,

14. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Third Cause of Action

15. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 200, et seq.

16. For unpaid commissions as may be appropriate.

17. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

18. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

19. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Fourth Cause of Action

20. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

21. For unpaid meal period premium wages as may be appropriate;

22. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

23. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

24. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

//

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

25. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

26. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate;

27. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

28. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment;

31. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 for former employees who have left Defendants' employ;

32. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

33. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

35. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

36. For all actual damages, according to proof;

37. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);

38. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h);

39. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

40. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

41. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, and failing to indemnify employees for expenditures;

42. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all Class Members and prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

43. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a result of violations of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*;

44. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5;

45. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and,

46. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

47. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods and pay the correct amount of meal period premium wages, failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay the correct amount of rest period premium wages, failing to pay all final wages to terminated employees, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to reimburse employees for all necessary business expenses.

48. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

49. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*, and all other applicable Labor Code provisions;

50. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699; and

1 For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

2 As to all Causes of Action

3 51. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.

4 Respectfully submitted,

5 Dated: February 29, 2024

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

6
7 By: 

Justin F. Marquez

Christina M. Le

Erik A. Dos Santos


8
9 Attorneys for Plaintiff

10
11
12 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

13 Plaintiff demands a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury.

14 Dated: February 29, 2024

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

15
16 By: 

Justin F. Marquez

Christina M. Le

Erik A. Dos Santos

17
18 Attorneys for Plaintiff

PROOF OF SERVICE

Dean Leduc v. Sully Insurance Center, LLC dba LACarGuy, et al.
23STCV23411

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

I, Sandy S. Sespene, state that I am employed in the aforesaid County, State of California; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90010. My electronic service address is ssespene@wilshirelawfirm.com.

On February 29, 2024, I served the foregoing **SECOND AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**, on the interested parties by placing a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope by following one of the methods of service as follows:

Robert W. Thompson (SBN 106411)
RThompson@ctsclaw.com
Alex A. Zolg (SBN 325754)
azolg@ctsclaw.com
Jackie C. Huynh
jhuynh@ctsclaw.com
Lori D. Unis
LUnis@ctsclaw.com
CALLAHAN THOMPSON SHERMAN & CAUDILL, LLP
2601 Main St., Suite 800
Irvine, CA 92614
Telephone: (949) 261-2872
Facsimile: (949) 261-6060

Attorneys for Defendant

(X) **BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE:** Based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept electronic service, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic service addresses listed above via third-party cloud service **CASEANYWHERE**.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on February 29, 2024, at Los Angeles, California.



Sandy S. Sespene