

COPY

FILED/ENDORSED

JAN - 9 2024

By: S. Woltmon
Deputy Clerk

D.LAW, INC.
Emil Davtyan (SBN 299363)
emil@d.law
David Yeremian (SBN 226337)
d.yeremian@d.law
David Keledjian (SBN 309135)
d.keledjian@d.law
David Arakelyan (SBN 337076)
d.arakelyan@d.law
880 E. Broadway
Glendale, CA 91205
Telephone: (818) 962-6465
Facsimile: (818) 962-6469

Attorneys for Plaintiff KATHARINE MARIE WILSON-DAVIS

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

KATHARINE MARIE WILSON-DAVIS, on
behalf of herself and all others similarly
situated, and the general public,

Plaintiff,

v.

HOLT OF CALIFORNIA, a California
corporation; HOLT HOLDINGS, LLC, a
California corporation; HOC HOLDINGS,
INC., a California corporation; HOLT AG
SOLUTIONS, LLC, a California corporation;
SITECH WEST, LLC, a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 23CV010721

Amended As a Matter of Right Pursuant to
Labor Code Section 2699.3(a)(2)(C)

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**

1. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7, 512 and 1198);
2. Failure to Provide Rest Periods (Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7 and 1198);
3. Failure to Pay Hourly Wages and Overtime (Lab. Code §§ 223, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1997.1 and 1198);
4. Failure to Provide Accurate Written Wage Statements (Lab. Code §§ 226(a));
5. Failure to Timely Pay All Final Wages (Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and 203);
6. Unfair Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*); and
7. Civil Penalties (Lab. Code § 2698, *et seq.*)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff KATHARINE MARIE WILSON-DAVIS (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself, all
2 others similarly situated, the State of California, and the general public, complains and alleges as
3 follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this class and representative action against Defendants HOLT OF
6 CALIFORNIA, a California corporation; HOLT HOLDINGS, LLC, a California corporation; HOC
7 HOLDINGS, INC., a California corporation; HOLT AG SOLUTIONS, LLC, a California
8 corporation; SITECH WEST, LLC, a California corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,
9 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for alleged violations of the California Labor Code and
10 California Business and Professions Code. As set forth below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have:

- 11 a. failed to pay them overtime wages at the correct rate;
- 12 b. failed to pay them double time wages at the correct rate;
- 13 c. failed to pay them overtime and/or double time wages by failing to include all
14 applicable remuneration in calculating the regular rate of pay;
- 15 d. failed to provide them with meal periods;
- 16 e. failed to provide them with rest periods;
- 17 f. failed to pay them premium wages for missed meal and rest periods;
- 18 g. failed to provide them with accurate written wage statements;
- 19 h. failed to pay them all their final wages following separation of employment.

20 Based on these alleged Labor Code violations, Plaintiff now brings this class and
21 representative action to recover unpaid wages, liquidated damages, civil and statutory penalties,
22 restitution, and related relief on behalf of herself, all others similarly situated, and the general public.

23 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

24 2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction to hear this case because the monetary
25 damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff from Defendants’ conduct exceeds the minimal
26 jurisdiction of the Superior Court of the State of California.

27 3. Venue is proper in the County of Sacramento pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure
28 sections 395(a) and 395.5 in that liability arose this county because at least some of the transactions

1 that are the subject matter of this Complaint occurred therein and/or each defendant is found,
2 maintains offices, transacts business and/or has an agent therein.

3 4. Venue is proper in Sacramento County because Defendants' have at all times alleged
4 herein, conducted business in Sacramento County, and throughout California. As such, venue is
5 proper in any county in California.

6 **PARTIES**

7 5. Plaintiff KATHARINE MARIE WILSON-DAVIS is, and at all relevant times
8 mentioned herein, an individual residing in the State of California.

9 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant HOLT OF
10 CALIFORNIA is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a California corporation doing business
11 in the State of California.

12 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant HOLT
13 HOLDINGS, LLC is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a California corporation doing
14 business in the State of California.

15 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant HOC
16 HOLDINGS, INC. is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a California corporation doing
17 business in the State of California.

18 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant HOLT AG
19 SOLUTIONS, LLC is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a California corporation doing
20 business in the State of California.

21 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant SITECH
22 WEST, LLC is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a California corporation doing business
23 in the State of California.

24 11. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of the defendants sued herein as
25 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff
26 will amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE defendants when
27 ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that each of the fictitiously
28 named defendants are responsible in some manner for the occurrences, acts and omissions alleged

1 herein and that Plaintiff's alleged damages were proximately caused by these defendants, and each of
2 them. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege both the true names and capacities of the DOE
3 defendants when ascertained.

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

10 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that, at all relevant times
11 mentioned herein, some of the defendants pursued a common course of conduct, acted in concert and
12 conspired with one another, and aided and abetted one another to accomplish the occurrences, acts
13 and omissions alleged herein.

14 14. This action has been brought and may be maintained as a class action pursuant to Code
15 of Civil Procedure section 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest among the
16 persons who comprise the readily ascertainable classes defined below and because Plaintiff is
17 unaware of any difficulties likely to be encountered in managing this case as a class action.

18 15. **Relevant Time Period:** The relevant time period is defined as the time period
19 beginning four years prior to the filing of this action until judgment is entered.

- 20 a. **Hourly Employee Class:** All persons employed by Defendants, collectively or
21 separately, and/or any staffing agencies and/or any other third parties in hourly or
22 non-exempt positions in California four years prior to the filing of this action and
ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action ("Hourly Employee
Class").
- 23 b. **Meal Period Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who worked in
24 a shift in excess of five hours during the four years prior to the filing of this action
and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.
- 25 c. **Rest Period Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who worked a
26 shift of at least three and one-half (3.5) hours the four years prior to the filing of
this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.
- 27 d. **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who
28 separated from their employment with Defendants during the period beginning
three years before the filing of this action and ending when final judgment is

entered.

e. **Wage Statement Class**: All persons employed by Defendants in California during the period beginning one year before the filing of this action and ending when final judgment is entered.

f. **UCL Class**: All **Hourly Employee Class** and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members employed by Defendants in California during the four years prior to the filing of this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.

16. **Reservation of Rights**: Pursuant to Rule of Court 3.765(b), Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or modify the class definitions with greater specificity, by further division into sub-classes and/or by limitation to particular issues.

17. **Numerosity**: The class members are so numerous that the individual joinder of each individual class member is impractical. While Plaintiff does not currently know the exact number of class members, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that the actual number exceeds the minimum required for numerosity under California law.

18. **Commonality and Predominance**: Common questions of law and fact exist as to all class members and predominate over any questions which affect only individual class members. These common questions include, but are not limited to:

- a. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to provide employees with their rest periods;
- b. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to provide employees with their meal periods;
- c. Whether Defendants failed to pay premium wages to class members when they have not been provided with meal and rest periods at the appropriate rates of pay;
- d. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum and/or overtime wages to class members for all time worked;
- e. Whether Defendants failed to pay proper sick time pay;
- f. Whether Defendants failed to provide class members with accurate written wage statements as a result of providing them with written wage statements with inaccurate entries for, among other things, amounts of gross and net wages, and

1 total hours worked;

2 g. Whether Defendants applied policies or practices that result in late and/or
3 incomplete final wage payments;

4 h. Whether Defendants are liable to class members for waiting time penalties under
5 Labor Code section 203; and

6 i. Whether class members are entitled to restitution of money or property that
7 Defendants may have acquired from them through unfair competition;

8 19. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the other class members' claims. Plaintiff
9 is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendants have a policy or practice of failing
10 to comply with the California Labor Code and Business and Professions Code as alleged in this
11 Complaint.

12 20. **Adequacy of Class Representative:** Plaintiff is an adequate class representative and
13 has no interests that are adverse to, or otherwise conflict with, the interests of absent class members
14 and is dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on their behalf. Plaintiff will fairly and
15 adequately represent and protect the interests of the other class members.

16 21. **Adequacy of Class Counsel:** Plaintiff's counsel are adequate class counsel in that
17 they have no known conflicts of interest with Plaintiff or absent class members, are experienced in
18 wage and hour class action litigation, and are dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf
19 of Plaintiff and absent class members.

20 22. **Superiority:** A class action is vastly superior to other available means for fair and
21 efficient adjudication of the class members' claims and would be beneficial to the parties and the
22 Court. Class action treatment will allow a number of similarly situated persons to simultaneously and
23 efficiently prosecute their common claims in a single forum without the unnecessary duplication of
24 effort and expense that numerous individual actions would entail. In addition, the monetary amounts
25 due to many individual class members are likely to be relatively small and would thus make it
26 difficult, if not impossible, for individual class members to both seek and obtain relief. Moreover, a
27 class action will serve an important public interest by permitting class members to effectively pursue
28 the recovery of monies owed to them. Further, a class action will prevent the potential for inconsistent

1 or contradictory judgments inherent in individual litigation.

2 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

3 23. Plaintiff worked for Defendants as a non-exempt employee during the relevant and
4 statutory periods.

5 24. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Plaintiff
6 and Class members proper wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay. First,
7 Defendants implemented an unlawful time-rounding policy and practice which rounded down and
8 reduced the actual working hours recorded by Plaintiff and Class Members, and upon which their pay
9 was based, and generally did so to the detriment of the Plaintiff and Class Members, and these
10 unlawfully rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants' payroll system from which wage
11 statements and payroll checks were created. Defendants did so with the ostensible intent of paying
12 Plaintiff and Class members only for the hours they were scheduled to work, rather than the hours
13 they were actually under Defendants' control. Plaintiff contends this policy is not neutral and results,
14 over time, to the detriment of the Plaintiff and Class members by systematically undercompensating
15 them.

16 25. Next, Plaintiff and Class Members were also consistently required to perform work,
17 off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members were
18 required to perform work during unpaid meal periods. However, Defendants implemented a common
19 policy and practice of automatically deducting 30 minutes of wages for alleged meal periods which
20 were systemically denied. Further, Plaintiff and Class Members consistently performed work before
21 clocking in, including having to gain access to the facility, perform various work-related activities,
22 and boot up the time-clock system, all prior to clocking in. Additionally, Plaintiff and Class Members
23 consistently performed work after clocking out, including work-related communications. The
24 forgoing and uncompensated working time was under the direction and control of Defendants, for
25 which no wages were paid.

26 26. This uncompensated time caused Plaintiff and Class Members to work in excess of
27 eight (8), ten (10) and/or twelve (12) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, entitling Plaintiff
28 and Class Members to minimum and overtime wages, which they were systemically denied.

1 27. Defendants also failed to Plaintiff and Class Members overtime wages at the proper
2 and applicable regular rates of pay. Plaintiff and Class Members were not paid one and a half (1.5)
3 times their effective and regular rate of pay for overtime hours worked.

4 28. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Plaintiff and
5 Class Members the opportunity to take meal periods in compliance with the California Law.
6 Specifically, Plaintiff and Class members consistently were required to work through their meal
7 periods. Defendants implemented a common policy and practice of automatically deducting 30
8 minutes of wages for alleged meal periods which were systemically denied.

9 29. Plaintiff and Class Members were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30)
10 minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal
11 period as part of each work shift; (2) no formal written meal policy that encouraged employees to
12 take their meal periods, or that advised Class Members of their meal and rest period rights; and (3)
13 Defendants' practice of requiring putative class members to continue working through their meal and
14 rest periods due to the excessive workload.

15 30. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Plaintiff and
16 Class Members the opportunity to take rest periods in compliance with the California Law. Plaintiff
17 and Class Members were not provided with rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4)
18 hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest
19 period as part of each work shift, including second rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2)
20 no formal compliant written rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their rest periods,
21 or that properly advised Plaintiff and Class Members of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy
22 and practice of requiring putative class members to continue working through their rest breaks due to
23 the excessive workload.

24 31. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members premium pay
25 wages at their appropriate regular rates of pay for each meal and rest period denied.

26 32. Plaintiff and Class Members were not provided with accurate wage statements as
27 mandated by law pursuant to Labor Code section 226. Specifically, Defendants failed to issue wage
28 statements as "a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or

1 separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing.”
2 Additionally, the wage statements issued to Plaintiff and Class Members were not recorded in “ink
3 or other indelible form.”

4 33. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(1) as “gross wages
5 earned” were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

6 34. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(2) as “total hours worked
7 by the employee” were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were
8 not included.

9 35. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(5) as “net wages earned”
10 were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

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

15 37. Furthermore, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with paper pay
16 stubs as required by Labor Code § 226, applicable Wage Orders, and DLSE Opinion Letters.
17 Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ wage statement were only provided in electronic format in violation
18 of Labor Code § 226.

19 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

21 **(Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1174, and 1198)**

22 **(Plaintiff and Meal Period Sub-Class)**

23 38. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if
24 fully alleged herein.

25 39. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** members have been
26 non-exempt employees of Defendant entitled to the full meal period protections of both the Labor
27 Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order.

28 40. Labor Code section 512 and Section 11 of the applicable Industrial Welfare

1 Commission Wage Order impose an affirmative obligation on employers to provide non-exempt
2 employees with uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods of at least thirty minutes for each work period
3 of five hours, and to provide them with two uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods of at least thirty
4 minutes for each work period of ten hours.

5 41. Labor Code section 226.7 and Section 11 of the applicable Industrial Welfare
6 Commission Wage Order (“Wage Order”) both prohibit employers from requiring employees to work
7 during required meal periods and require employers to pay non-exempt employees an hour of
8 premium wages on each workday that the employee is not provided with the required meal period.

9 42. Compensation for missed meal periods constitutes wages within the meaning of Labor
10 Code section 200.

11 43. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful to employ a person under conditions that
12 violate the applicable Wage Order.

13 44. Section 11 of the applicable Wage Order states:

14 No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than
15 five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except
16 that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete
17 the day’s work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of
18 the employer and employee. Unless the employee is relieved of all duty
19 during a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an
20 ‘on duty’ meal period and counted as time worked. An ‘on duty’ meal
period shall be permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an
employee from being relieved of all duty and when by written
agreement between the parties an on-the-job paid meal period is agreed
to. The written agreement shall state that the employee may, in writing,
revoke the agreement at any time.

21 45. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was not subject to a valid on-duty meal period
22 agreement. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times, **Meal Period Sub-Class**
23 members were not subject to valid on-duty meal period agreements with Defendants.

24 46. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
25 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and members of the **Meal Period**
26 **Sub-Class** with uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5)
27 hour work period, as required by Labor Code section 512 and the applicable Wage Order.
28 Specifically, Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members consistently were required to work

1 through their meal periods. Defendants implemented a common policy and practice of automatically
2 deducting 30 minutes of wages for alleged meal periods which were systemically denied.

3 47. Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members were not provided with meal periods
4 of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not
5 scheduling each meal period as part of each work shift; (2) no formal written meal policy that
6 encouraged employees to take their meal periods, or that advised **Meal Period Sub-Class** members
7 of their meal and rest period rights; and (3) Defendants' practice of requiring **Meal Period Sub-Class**
8 members to continue working through their meal and rest periods due to the excessive workload.

9 48. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
10 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to pay premium wages to **Meal Period Sub-**
11 **Class** members when they worked five (5) hours without clocking out for any meal period.

12 49. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
13 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and members of the **Meal Period**
14 **Sub-Class** with a second meal period when they worked shifts of ten (10) or more hours and failed
15 to pay them premium wages as required by Labor Code 512 and the applicable Wage Order.

16 50. Moreover, Defendants written policies fail to inform Meal period Class Members of
17 their meal period rights under the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

18 51. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the **Meal Period Sub-**
19 **Class** members additional premium wages, and/or were not paid premium wages at the employees'
20 regular rates of pay when required meal periods were not provided.

21 52. Pursuant to Labor Code section 204, 218.6, 226.7 and 512, Plaintiff, on behalf of
22 herself and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid premium wages, interest
23 thereon, and costs of suit.

24 53. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
25 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the
26 **Meal Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

27 ///

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

22
23
24
25
26
27
28

26
27
28

1 rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that
2 encouraged employees to take their rest periods, or that properly advised Plaintiff and **Rest Period**
3 **Sub-Class** members of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring **Rest**
4 **Period Sub-Class** members to continue working through their rest breaks due to the excessive
5 workload.

6 62. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the **Rest Period Sub-Class**
7 members additional premium wages when required rest periods were not provided.

8 63. Pursuant to Labor Code section 204, 218.6 and 226.7, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself
9 and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid premium wages, interest thereon, and
10 costs of suit.

11 64. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
12 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and **Rest**
13 **Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

14 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **FAILURE TO PAY HOURLY AND OVERTIME WAGES**

16 **(Lab. Code §§ 223, 510, 1194, 1197 and 1198)**

17 **(Plaintiff and Hourly Employee Class)**

18 65. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
19 herein.

20 66. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members are or have been
21 non-exempt employees of Defendants entitled to the full protections of the Labor Code and the
22 applicable Wage Order.

23 67. Section 2 of the applicable Wage Order defines "hours worked" as "the time during
24 which an employee is subject to the control of the employer, and includes all the time the employee
25 is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so."

26 68. Section 4 of the applicable Wage Order requires an employer to pay non-exempt
27 employees at least the minimum wage set forth therein for all hours worked, which consist of all hours
28 that an employer has actual or constructive knowledge that employees are working.

1 69. Labor Code section 1194 invalidates any agreement between an employer and an
2 employee to work for less than the minimum or overtime wage required under the applicable Wage
3 Order.

4 70. Labor Code section 1194.2 entitles non-exempt employees to recover liquidated
5 damages in amounts equal to the amounts of unpaid minimum wages and interest thereon in addition
6 to the underlying unpaid minimum wages and interest thereon.

7 71. Labor Code section 1197 makes it unlawful for an employer to pay an employee less
8 than the minimum wage required under the applicable Wage Order for all hours worked during a
9 payroll period.

10 72. Labor Code section 1197.1 provides that it is unlawful for any employer or any other
11 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent or employee of another person, to pay an
12 employee, or cause an employee to be paid, less than the applicable minimum wage.

13 73. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful for employers to employ employees under
14 conditions that violate the applicable Wage Order.

15 74. Labor Code section 204 requires employers to pay non-exempt employees their earned
16 wages for the normal work period at least twice during each calendar month on days the employer
17 designates in advance and to pay non-exempt employees their earned wages for labor performed in
18 excess of the normal work period by no later than the next regular payday.

19 75. Labor Code section 223 makes it unlawful for employers to pay their employees lower
20 wages than required by contract or statute while purporting to pay them legal wages.

21 76. Labor Code section 510 and Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order require employees
22 to pay non-exempt employees overtime wages of no less than one and one-half (1.5) times their
23 respective regular rates of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, all
24 hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and/or for the first eight (8) hours
25 worked on the seventh consecutive day of one workweek.

26 77. Labor Code section 510 and Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order also require
27 employers to pay non-exempt employees overtime wages of no less than two (2) times their respective
28 regular rates of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for all

1 hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on a seventh consecutive workday during the workweek.

2 78. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times, Defendants have applied
3 centrally devised policies and practices to her and **Hourly Employee Class** members with respect to
4 working conditions and compensation arrangements.

5 79. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay hourly wages to Plaintiff and **Hourly**
6 **Employee Class** members for all time worked, including but not limited to, overtime hours at
7 statutory and/or agreed rates.

8 80. Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were not paid proper wages and
9 overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay. First, Defendants implemented an unlawful
10 time-rounding policy and practice which rounded down and reduced the actual working hours
11 recorded by Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class**, and upon which their pay was based, and
12 generally did so to the detriment of the Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class**, and these unlawfully
13 rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants' payroll system from which wage statements and
14 payroll checks were created. Defendants did so with the ostensible intent of paying Plaintiff and
15 **Hourly Employee Class** members only for the hours they were scheduled to work, rather than the
16 hours they were actually under Defendants' control. Plaintiff contends this policy is not neutral and
17 results, over time, to the detriment of the Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members by
18 systematically undercompensating them.

19 81. Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were consistently required to perform
20 work, off-the-clock for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee**
21 **Class** members were required to perform work during unpaid meal periods. However, Defendants
22 implemented a common policy and practice of automatically deducting 30 minutes of wages for
23 alleged meal periods which were systemically denied. Further, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class**
24 members consistently performed work before clocking in, including having to gain access to the
25 facility, perform various work-related activities, and boot up the time-clock system, all prior to
26 clocking in. Additionally, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members consistently performed
27 work after clocking out, including work-related communications. The forgoing and uncompensated
28 working time was under the direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages were paid. This

1 uncompensated time caused Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members to work in excess of
2 eight (8), ten (10), and twelve (12) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, entitling Plaintiff and
3 **Hourly Employee Class** members to minimum and overtime wages, which they were systemically
4 denied.

5 82. Defendants also failed to Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members overtime
6 wages at the proper and applicable regular rates of pay. Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class**
7 members were not paid one and a half (1.5) times their effective and regular rate of pay for overtime
8 hours worked.

9 83. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class**
10 members have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid the
11 full amount of wages earned during each pay period during the applicable limitations period,
12 including overtime wages.

13 84. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 218.6, 223, 510, 1194 and 1194.2, Plaintiff, on
14 behalf of herself and **Hourly Employee Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid straight time and
15 overtime wages, interest thereon and costs of suit.

16 85. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
17 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and
18 **Hourly Employee Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

19 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE WRITTEN WAGE STATEMENTS**

21 **(Lab. Code § 226)**

22 **(Plaintiff and Wage Statement Penalties Sub-Class)**

23 86. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
24 herein.

25 87. Labor Code section 226(a) states:

26 An employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages,
27 shall furnish to his or her employee, either as a detachable part of the
28 check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if
wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized
statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours

1 worked by the employee, except as provided in subdivision (j), (3) the
2 number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the
3 employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that
4 all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be
5 aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the
6 inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the
7 name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social
8 security number or an employee identification number other than a
9 social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that
10 is the employer and, if the employer is a farm labor contractor, as
11 defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682, the name and address of the
12 legal entity that secured the services of the employer, and (9) all
13 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the
employee and, beginning July 1, 2013, if the employer is a temporary
services employer as defined in Section 201.3, the rate of pay and the
total hours worked for each temporary services assignment. The
deductions made from payment of wages shall be recorded in ink or
other indelible form, properly dated, showing the month, day, and year,
and a copy of the statement and the record of the deductions shall be
kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of
employment or at a central location within the State of California. For
purposes of this subdivision, ‘copy’ includes a duplicate of the itemized
statement provided to an employee or a computer-generated record that
accurately shows all of the information required by this subdivision.

14 88. The Division of Labor Standards Enforcement (“DLSE”) has sought to harmonize the
15 “detachable part of the check” provision and the “accurate itemized statement in writing” provision
16 of Labor Code section 226(a) by allowing for electronic wage statements so long as each employee
17 retains the right to elect to receive a written paper stub or record and that those who are provided with
18 electronic wage statements retain the ability to easily access the information and convert the electronic
19 statements into hard copies at no expense to the employee. (DLSE Opinion Letter July 6, 2006).

20 89. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable
21 limitations period, Defendants have failed to provide Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class** members
22 with written wage statements as described above. Additionally, the wage statements issued to class
23 members failed to account for the unpaid minimum wages, overtime, and premium pay wages
24 described above.

25 90. Furthermore, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class**
26 Members with paper pay stubs as required by Labor Code § 226, applicable Wage Orders, and DLSE
27 Opinion Letters. Plaintiff’s and **Wage Statement Class** members’ wage statements were only
28 provided in electronic format in violation of Labor Code § 226.

91. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class** members with accurate written wage statements was intentional in that Defendants have the ability to provide them with accurate wage statements but have intentionally provided them with written wage statements that Defendants have known do not comply with Labor Code section 226(a).

92. Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class** members have suffered injuries, in that Defendants have violated their legal rights to receive accurate wage statements and have misled them about their actual rates of pay and wages earned. In addition, inaccurate information on their wage statements has prevented immediate challenges to Defendants' unlawful pay practices, has required discovery and mathematical computations to determine the amount of wages owed, has caused difficulty and expense in attempting to reconstruct time and pay records, and/or has led to the submission of inaccurate information about wages and deductions to federal and state government agencies.

93. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226(e), Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and **Wage Statement Class** members, seeks the greater of actual damages or \$50.00 for the initial pay period in which a violation of Labor Code section 226(a) occurred, and \$100.00 for each subsequent pay period in which a violation of Labor Code section 226(a) occurred, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of \$4000.00 per class member, as well as awards of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL FINAL WAGES

(Lab. Code §§ 201-203)

(Plaintiff and Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class)

94. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

95. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members have been entitled, upon the end of their employment with Defendants, to timely payment of all wages earned and unpaid before termination or resignation.

96. At all relevant times, pursuant to Labor Code section 201, employees who have been

1 discharged have been entitled to payment of all final wages immediately upon termination.

2 97. At all relevant times, pursuant to Labor Code section 202, employees who have
3 resigned after giving at least seventy-two (72) hours' notice of resignation have been entitled to
4 payment of all final wages at the time of resignation.

5 98. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable
6 limitations period, Defendants have failed to timely pay **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class**
7 members all their final wages in accordance with the Labor Code.

8 99. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable
9 limitations period, Defendants have maintained a policy or practice of paying **Waiting Time**
10 **Penalties Sub-Class** members their final wages without regard to the requirements of Labor Code
11 sections 201 or 202 by failing to timely pay them all final wages.

12 100. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendants' failure to
13 timely pay all final wages to her and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members has been willful
14 in that Defendants have the ability to pay final wages in accordance with Labor Code sections 201
15 and/or 202 but have intentionally adopted policies or practices that are incompatible with those
16 requirements.

17 101. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 203 and 218.6, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and
18 **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members, seeks waiting time penalties from the dates that their
19 final wages have first become due until paid, up to a maximum of thirty days, and interest thereon.

20 102. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine
21 and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-**
22 **Class** members, seeks awards of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

23 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

25 **(Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 et seq.)**

26 **(Plaintiff and UCL Class)**

27 103. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
28 herein.

1 104. Business and Professions Code section 17200 defines “unfair competition” to include
2 any unlawful business practice.

3 105. Business and Professions Code sections 17203-17204 allow a person who has lost
4 money or property as a result of unfair competition to bring a class action in accordance with Code
5 of Civil Procedure section 382 to recover money or property that may have been acquired from
6 similarly situated persons by means of unfair competition.

7 106. California law requires employers to pay hourly, non-exempt employees for all hours
8 they are permitted or suffered to work, including hours that the employer knows or reasonable should
9 know that employees have worked.

10 107. Plaintiff and the **UCL Class** members re-allege and incorporate the FIRST, SECOND,
11 and THIRD, causes of action herein.

12 108. Plaintiff lost money or property as a result of the aforementioned unfair competition.

13 109. Defendants have or may have acquired money by means of unfair competition.

14 110. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that by committing the Labor
15 Code violations described in this Complaint, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 215, 216, 225,
16 226.6, 226.7, 354, 408, 512, 510, 553, 1175, 1174, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 1199 as
17 well as applicable Wage Orders, which make it a misdemeanor to commit the violations alleged
18 herein.

19 111. Defendants have committed criminal conduct through their policies and practices of,
20 *inter alia*, failing to comport with their affirmative obligations as an employer to: provide non-exempt
21 employees with compliant meal and rest periods; pay for all hours worked at the proper rates of pay;
22 and proper sick time pay.

23 112. Defendants’ unlawful conduct as alleged in this Complaint amounts to and constitutes
24 unfair competition within the meaning of Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.*
25 Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.* protects against unfair competition and allows
26 a person who has suffered an injury-in-fact and has lost money or property as a result of an unfair,
27 unlawful or fraudulent business practice to seek restitution on his own behalf and on behalf of
28 similarly situated persons in a class action proceeding.

1 113. As a result of Defendants' violations of the Labor Code during the applicable
2 limitations period, Plaintiff has suffered an injury-in-fact and has lost money or property in the form
3 of earned wages. Specifically, Plaintiff has lost money or property as a result of Defendants' conduct.

4 114. Plaintiff is informed and believes that other similarly situated persons have been
5 subject to the same unlawful policies or practices of Defendants.

6 115. Due to the unfair and unlawful business practices in violation of the Labor Code,
7 Defendants have gained a competitive advantage over other comparable companies doing business in
8 the State of California that comply with their legal obligations.

9 116. California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL") permits civil recovery and injunctive
10 relief for "any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice," including if a practice or act
11 violates or is considered unlawful under any other state or federal law.

12 117. Accordingly, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200 and 17203,
13 Plaintiff requests the issuance of temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining
14 Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from further violations of the Labor
15 Code and applicable Wage Orders.

16 118. Accordingly, pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code sections 17200 and 17203, Plaintiff
17 requests the issuance of temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining
18 Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from further violations of the Labor
19 Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders; and upon a final hearing seeks
20 an order permanently enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their respective agents and
21 employees, from further violations of the Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission
22 Wage Orders.

23 119. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203, Plaintiff, on behalf of
24 herself and **UCL Class** members, seeks declaratory relief and restitution of all monies rightfully
25 belonging to them that Defendants did not pay them or otherwise retained by means of its unlawful
26 and unfair business practices.

27 120. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine
28 and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff and **UCL Class** members are entitled to recover

reasonable attorneys' fees in connection with their unfair competition claims.

121. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and **UCL Class** members, seeks declaratory relief and restitution of all monies rightfully belonging to them that Defendants did not pay them or otherwise retained by means of its unlawful and unfair business practices.

122. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff and **UCL Class** members are entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees in connection with their unfair competition claims.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

CIVIL PENALTIES

(Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*)

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

124. During the applicable limitations period, Defendants have violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 515, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, and 2699, *et seq.*¹

125. Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on behalf of herself and other current and former employees, to bring a representative civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures set forth in Labor Code § 2699.3 that may, but need not, be brought or maintained as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

126. Plaintiff, a former employee against whom Defendants committed one or more of the alleged Labor Code violations during the applicable limitations period, is an aggrieved employee within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699(c). Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt hourly employee in California. Aggrieved Employees include all non-exempt hourly employees of Defendants within the state of California from one year prior to the date of this letter and continuing

¹ Plaintiff hereby reserves the right to seek penalties on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, for Defendants' violations of the applicable provisions of the Labor Code, suffered by Aggrieved Employees, but not directly suffered by Plaintiff under *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745.

1 through the present (Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are collectively referred to herein as
2 “Aggrieved Employees”)

3 127. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code §
4 2699.3. Notice was provided to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”)
5 and 65 days have elapsed without the LWDA providing Plaintiff with any notice of an intent to
6 investigate.

7 128. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff seeks the following civil
8 penalties for Defendants’ violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226.7, 226(a), 510,
9 512, 1174, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198:

- 10 i. For violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226.7, 1174, 1194, and 1198,
11 one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee per pay period for each initial
12 violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee per pay period for
13 each subsequent violation (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2));
- 14 ii. For violations of Labor Code § 203, a penalty in an amount not exceeding thirty
15 (30) days’ pay as waiting time (penalties set by Labor Code § 256);
- 16 iii. For violations of Labor Code § 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
17 employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two
18 hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully
19 withheld from each employee, for each initial violation that was either willful
20 or intentional, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-
21 five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee,
22 for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the subsequent violation
23 was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 210);
- 24 iv. For violations of Labor Code § 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
25 employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two
26 hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of
27 the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each initial violation
28 that was either willful or intentional, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each

employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the subsequent violation was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 225.5);

v. For violations of Labor Code § 226(a), if this action is deemed to be an initial citation, two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each employee for each violation. Alternatively, if an initial citation or its equivalent occurred before the filing of this action, one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each employee for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code § 226.3);

vi. For violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50) for each employee for each initial pay period for which the employee was underpaid, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee for each subsequent pay period for which the employee was underpaid (penalties set by Labor Code § 558);

vii. For violations of Labor Code § 1197, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1197 that was intentional and two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation of Labor Code § 1197, regardless of whether the initial violation was intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 1197.1);

viii. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g), Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with Plaintiff's claims for civil penalties.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself, all others similarly situated, and the general public, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- a. An order that the action be certified as a class action;
- b. An order that Plaintiff be appointed class representative;

- c. An order that counsel for Plaintiff be appointed class counsel;
- d. Unpaid wages and overtime;
- e. Actual damages;
- f. Liquidated damages;
- g. Restitution;
- h. Declaratory relief;
- i. Pre-judgment interest;
- j. Civil penalties;
- k. Statutory penalties;
- l. Costs of suit;
- m. Reasonable attorneys' fees; and
- n. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: January 8, 2024

D.LAW, INC.



Emil Davtyan
David Yeremian
David Keledjian
David Arakelyan
Attorneys for Plaintiff
KATHARINE MARIE WILSON-DAVIS, and
the putative class

1 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

2 Plaintiff, on behalf of herself, all other similarly situated, and the general public, hereby
3 demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

4
5 Dated: January 8, 2024

D.LAW, INC.

6
7
8 

9 _____
10 Emil Davtyan
11 David Yeremian
12 David Keledjian
13 David Arakelyan
14 Attorneys for Plaintiff
15 KATHARINE MARIE WILSON-DAVIS, and
16 the putative class
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
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

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES:

I am employed in the aforesaid county, State of California; I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 880 E Broadway, Glendale, CA 91205.

On January 8, 2024, I served the foregoing: **FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT** on Interested Parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope, addressed as follows:

Hallie Spaulding
Jessica Kleinhans
PALMER KAZANJIAN WOHL HODSON LLP
2277 Fair Paks Blvd. Suite 455
Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: (916) 442-3552
Fax: (916) 640-1521
Email: hspaulding@pkwhlaw.com
Email: jkleinhans@pkwhlaw.com


☒ **(BY MAIL)** I placed such envelope with postage thereon fully paid in the United States mail at Glendale, California. I am "readily familiar" with this firm's practice of collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. It is deposited with U.S. Postal Service on that same day in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than 1 day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

☐ **(BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY)** I enclosed the documents in an envelope or package provided by an overnight delivery carrier and addressed to the persons at the address above. I placed the envelope or package for collection and overnight delivery at an office or a regularly utilized drop box of the overnight delivery carrier.

☒ **(COURTESY COPY BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION)** by use of email by scanning the documents and any and all documents and emailing them to email addresses above.

☒ **(STATE)** I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January 8, 2024, at Glendale, California.



Jordan Floyd