

Kane Moon (SBN 249834)  
 kmoon@moonlawgroup.com  
 H. Scott Leviant (SBN 200834)  
 hsleviant@moonlawgroup.com  
 Mariam Ghazaryan (SBN 341119)  
 mghazaryan@moonlawgroup.com  
**MOON LAW GROUP, PC**  
 1055 W. Seventh St., Suite 1880  
 Los Angeles, California 90017  
 Telephone: (213) 232-3128  
 Facsimile: (213) 232-3125

Attorneys for Plaintiff Diane Gonzalez

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

DIANE GONZALEZ, individually, and on  
 behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PAYDEN & RYGEL, INC., a California  
 corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants

Case No.: 23STCV25914

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

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197];
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Compensation [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198];
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512];
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Breaks [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7];
5. Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses [Cal. Lab. Code § 2802];
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 § 2698, et seq.].

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|                                                  |    |
|--------------------------------------------------|----|
| INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.....        | 1  |
| THE PARTIES .....                                | 3  |
| A. Plaintiff.....                                | 3  |
| B. Defendants.....                               | 3  |
| ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION ..... | 4  |
| CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS .....                   | 8  |
| FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION.....                       | 12 |
| SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION.....                      | 13 |
| THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION .....                      | 14 |
| FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....                      | 15 |
| FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....                       | 16 |
| SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....                       | 16 |
| SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....                     | 17 |
| EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....                      | 19 |
| NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION .....                      | 22 |
| PRAYER FOR RELIEF.....                           | 24 |
| DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL .....                      | 28 |

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

#### 4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants Payden & Rygel, Inc., and Does 1  
6 through 10 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor Code violations and  
7 unfair business practices stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wages, failure to  
8 pay overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods,  
9 failure to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failure to timely pay all  
10 wages to terminated employees, failure to indemnify necessary business expenses, and failure to  
11 furnish accurate wage statements.

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

18 3. Plaintiff brings the Ninth Cause of Action as a representative action under the  
19 California Private Attorney General Act (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties that are owed to  
20 Plaintiff, the State of California, and past and present employees of Defendant (hereinafter  
21 referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”).

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

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

- (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;
- (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period violation occurred;
- (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a rest period violation occurred;
- (d) Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred;
- (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages due within the time period specified by California law when employment terminates; and
- (f) Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked.
- (g) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

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

7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the 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 is a California resident that worked for Defendants in the County of Los  
6 Angeles, State of California, as a receptionist and assistant in Los Angeles County from  
7 approximately April 2005 to December 2022.

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 Defendant Payden & Rygel, Inc. is:

- 14 (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in Los  
15 Angeles, California;
- 16 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the  
17 State of California, including in Los Angeles County; and
- 18 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer  
19 of the putative Class. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the  
20 Class to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

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

27 12. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and  
28 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of,

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

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

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

16 14. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of Los  
17 Angeles, State of California, as a receptionist and assistant from approximately April 2005 to  
18 December 2022. During the statutory period, Defendants classified Plaintiff as a non-exempt  
19 employee, and paid Plaintiff and hourly wage.

20 15. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours  
21 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with  
22 uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take uninterrupted rest  
23 periods, failed to indemnify Plaintiff for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all  
24 final wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment, and failed to furnish  
25 accurate wage statements to Plaintiff. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for  
26 Defendants was typical and illustrative.

27 16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of  
28 not paying Plaintiff and the Class for all hours worked, including all overtime wages. Throughout

1 the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Class were required to work off the clock, and  
2 uncompensated. For example, Plaintiff and the Class were required to use their own personal  
3 cellular telephones for work purposes, both on and off the clock, some of which was  
4 uncompensated. Also, Plaintiff and the Class were required to perform work duties prior to  
5 clocking into work, and after clocking out of work. For example, Plaintiff were required to badge  
6 in at the lobby and again at the elevators. When Plaintiff and the Class forgot their badges, they  
7 were required to take additional time to check in with security. Further, Plaintiff and the Class  
8 regularly checked their emails from their cellular telephones while off the clock. Plaintiff and the  
9 Class also booted up their computers to log in and prepare for the day prior to clocking into  
10 work. Also throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Class received non-discretionary  
11 bonuses and other remuneration. However, Defendants failed to incorporate all remuneration  
12 when calculating the correct overtime rate of pay, sick day rate of pay, and meal break premium  
13 rate of pay, leading to underpayment.

14 17. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to provide  
15 Plaintiff and the Class with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants sometimes, but not  
16 always, required Plaintiff and the Class to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without  
17 providing 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of  
18 work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Class for meal periods that were not provided by  
19 the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not adequately  
20 inform Plaintiff and the Class of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of  
21 work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Defendants also  
22 failed to accurately record meal periods. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not  
23 provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the Class in compliance with California law.

24 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize  
25 and permit Plaintiff and the Class to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendants  
26 sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff and the Class to work in excess of four consecutive  
27 hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, continuous  
28 and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or

1 without compensating Plaintiff and the Class for rest periods that were not authorized or  
2 permitted. Defendants also did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Class of their right to take  
3 a rest period. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or  
4 authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff and the Class, nor did Defendants have adequate policies or  
5 practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendants also did not have adequate policies or  
6 practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Class were taking their required rest periods.  
7 Further, Defendants did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore  
8 Defendants cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff and the Class took rest periods during the middle of  
9 each work period. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not authorize and permit  
10 Plaintiff and the Class to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

11       19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and the  
12 Class to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants without  
13 reimbursement. Plaintiff and the Class were required purchase masks, and to use their personal  
14 cellular telephones for work purposes. Also, Plaintiff and the Class were required to work from  
15 home, but were not reimbursed home office expenses such as personal computers, home internet,  
16 monitors, printers, paper, ink cartridges, and office supplies. Also, Plaintiff and the Class were  
17 sometimes required to use their own personal vehicles for work purposes, without  
18 reimbursement.

19       20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely  
20 pay Plaintiff and the Class at the conclusion of their employment all wages for all minimum  
21 wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages.

22       21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and the  
23 Class with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross  
24 and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned for hours worked,  
25 correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in  
26 accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and  
27 permitted to take in accordance with California law, and Defendant's address). Further, the wage  
28 statements do not show Defendant's address as required by California law. As a result of these

violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiff and the Class suffered injury because, among other things:

- (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages to which they were entitled, even though they were entitled;
- (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even though they had not been;
- (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they were;
- (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they had not been;
- (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage statements contained the required accurate information;
- (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;
- (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages rates to which Plaintiff and the Class were entitled, and Plaintiff and the

1 Class were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they were  
2 entitled.

3 Thus, Plaintiff and the Class are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code §  
4 226(e), including actual damages.

5 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

6 22. Plaintiff brings certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all  
7 other persons similarly situated, and thus, seek class certification under California Code of Civil  
8 Procedure § 382.

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

11 24. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

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

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

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

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

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

26 (b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect  
27 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-  
28

defined community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) 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

1 employers might damage their future endeavors through negative  
2 references and/or other means. Class actions provide the class members  
3 who are not named in the complaint with a type of anonymity that allows  
4 for the vindication of their rights at the same time as their privacy is  
5 protected.

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

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

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

- 25 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any  
26 question affecting only individual members;
- 27 (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and  
28 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;

- 1 (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all  
2 members of the class before the Court;
- 3 (d) Plaintiff, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain  
4 effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a  
5 class action;
- 6 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and  
7 equitable relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate  
8 compensation for the damages and injuries for which Defendants are  
9 responsible in an amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members  
10 of the Class for the injuries sustained;
- 11 (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by  
12 individual members of the class would create a risk of:
- 13 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual  
14 members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards  
15 of conduct for Defendants; and/or
- 16 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would,  
17 as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other  
18 members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially  
19 impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including but  
20 not limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from  
21 those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,
- 22 (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to  
23 the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to  
24 the class as a whole.

25 30. Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of  
26 the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own  
27 business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the  
28 contemplated notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiff would

1 contemplate the use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as  
2 published notice, e-mail notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by  
3 other methods suitable to the Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

#### 4 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

##### 5 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Minimum Wages for All Hours Worked)**

6 31. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein  
7 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

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

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

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

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

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

25 37. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code §  
26 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage  
27 compensation due Plaintiff and the Class.  
28

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

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

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

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

**(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)**

41. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

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

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

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

45. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the maximum hours

permissible by law as required by California Labor Code § 510 and 1198. Plaintiff and the Class are regularly required to work overtime hours.

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

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

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

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

### **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

50. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

51. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the Plaintiff and the Class of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than the start of Plaintiff and the Class's sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal periods no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Section 512 of the California Labor Code, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an employer

1 provide unpaid meal periods of at least 30 minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a  
2 violation of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code for an employer to require any employee  
3 to work during any meal period mandated under any Wage Order.

4 52. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiff  
5 and the Class with both meal periods as required by California law. By their failure to permit  
6 and authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take all meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact  
7 that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods),  
8 Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code and  
9 the applicable Wage Orders.

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

#### 13 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

15 54. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein  
16 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

17 55. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10  
18 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than  
19 two hours). Section 512 of the California Labor Code, the applicable Wage Orders require that  
20 the employer permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of 10 minutes each for  
21 each 4-hour period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten  
22 minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so  
23 required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of Section 226.7 of  
24 the California Labor Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest  
25 period mandated under any Wage Order.

26 56. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiff and the  
27 Class to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked more than 4 hours in a  
28 workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take rest periods as

1 alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take  
2 these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 226.7 of  
3 the California Labor Code and the applicable Wage Orders.

4 57. Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of  
5 premium wages rate for each workday he or she was not provided with all required rest break(s),  
6 plus interest thereon.

#### 7 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

##### 8 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses)**

9 58. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein  
10 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

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

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

17 61. Plaintiff and the class they represent are entitled to attorney's fees, expenses, and  
18 costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(c) and interest pursuant to Labor Code section  
19 2802(b).

#### 20 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

##### 21 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees – Waiting Time** 22 **Penalties)**

23 62. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein  
24 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

25 63. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if  
26 an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are  
27 due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment,  
28 his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter,

1 unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to  
2 quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

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

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

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

17 67. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally  
18 accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days  
19 maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

20 68. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, Plaintiff and the  
21 Class are also entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs  
22 incurred in this action.

### 23 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### 24 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and** 25 **Compliant Wage Records)**

26 69. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein  
27 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

28 70. 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.

71. 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.

72. 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.

73. 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).

74. 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.

75. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their actual damages caused by Defendants’ failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a).

76. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief, as well as an award of

1 attorney's fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor  
2 Code § 226(h).

3 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **(Against all Defendants for Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200,**  
5 **et seq.)**

6 77. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein  
7 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

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

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

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

17 81. A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be  
18 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as  
19 violations of, among other things, the California Labor Code, are unlawful and in violation of  
20 public policy; and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive, fraudulent and unscrupulous,  
21 and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in violation of  
22 California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

23 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

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

27 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

28 83. 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 Maintain Accurate Records of All Hours Worked**

84. Defendants' failure to maintain accurate records of all hours worked in accordance with California Labor Code § 1174.5 and the IWC Wage Orders constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

**Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

85. 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**

86. 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.*

**Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses**

87. Defendants' failure to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses in accordance with California Labor Code § 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

**Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

88. Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements in accordance with California Labor Code § 226, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

89. 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 have deprived Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated, of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

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

1 Defendants' wrongful conduct.

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

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

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

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

23 95. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiff  
24 and putative Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by  
25 Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a  
26 permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and  
27 Class Members; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §  
28 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

1 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

4 96. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein  
5 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

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

8 98. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action  
9 to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “Notwithstanding any other provision of  
10 law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by  
11 the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions,  
12 commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative,  
13 be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or  
14 herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section  
15 2699.3.”

16 99. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor  
17 Code § 2699.3. On October 22, 2023, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor  
18 and Workforce Development Agency and, and on October 24, 2023, Plaintiff certified mail to the  
19 Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and Defendants of the specific provisions of the  
20 Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and former aggrieved  
21 employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations (See attached as Exhibit A).  
22 Plaintiff’s PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-989212-23. At the time of this filing, 65 days has  
23 elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice, but the Labor and Workforce Development Agency has  
24 not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’ Labor Code violations discussed in the  
25 notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil action to recover penalties under Labor  
26 Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code described in this  
27 Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under California Labor Code  
28 §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

1           100. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants' violation of California Labor  
2 Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity,  
3 employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by  
4 California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable  
5 IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee  
6 begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall also be  
7 recorded. Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every employer shall  
8 keep total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

9           101. During the time period of employment for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees,  
10 Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the Labor Code and IWC Orders by failing to  
11 maintain accurate records showing meal periods, and accurate records showing when employees  
12 begin and end each work period. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records required by  
13 the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to  
14 know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of  
15 their hours worked stated in Defendants' records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved  
16 Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an  
17 unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved  
18 Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and  
19 enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking  
20 to compel Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective  
21 damage in amounts according to proof at trial. Because of Defendants' knowing failure to  
22 comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved  
23 Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing,  
24 understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

25           102. Based on the conduct described in this First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff is  
26 entitled to an award of civil penalties on behalf of themselves, the State of California, and  
27 similarly Aggrieved Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in  
28

1 all, is in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all  
2 other remedies permitted by law.

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

6 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

10 **Class Certification**

11 1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second,  
12 Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action;

13 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class; and

14 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

15 **As to the First Cause of Action**

16 4. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California  
17 Labor Code §§ 204 and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all  
18 minimum wages due;

19 5. For general unpaid wages as may be appropriate;

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

22 7. For liquidated damages;

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

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

26 **As to the Second Cause of Action**

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

overtime wages due;

11. For general 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 §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

16. For unpaid meal period premium wages 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 under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, 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 rest 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 Labor Code § 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders;

1           26.     For general unpaid wages and reimbursement of business expenses as may be  
2 appropriate;

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

5           28.     For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

7                               As to the Sixth Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

17                               As to the Seventh Cause of Action

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

21          36.     For penalties and actual damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);

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

24          38.     For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

26                               As to the Eighth Cause of Action

27          40.     That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California  
28 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay wages for all hours worked

(including minimum and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, and failing to maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to indemnify necessary business expenses;

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

42. 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.*;

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

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

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

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

46. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failure to timely pay all wages to terminated employees, failure to indemnify necessary business expenses, and failure to furnish accurate wage statements;

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

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

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

As to all Causes of Action

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

1 Dated: December 28, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

2 **MOON LAW GROUP, PC**

3 By:   
4 Kane Moon  
5 H. Scott Leviant  
6 Mariam Ghazaryan  
7 Attorneys for Plaintiff

8 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

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

10 Dated: December 28, 2023

**MOON LAW GROUP, PC**

11 By:   
12 Kane Moon  
13 H. Scott Leviant  
14 Mariam Ghazaryan  
15 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
 ) ss  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES )

## FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT

Martha S. Doty  
Kaitlin H. Owen  
**ALSTON & BIRD LLP**  
333 South Hope Street, 16th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1410  
martha.doty@alston.com  
kaitlin.owen@alston.com

1  
PROOF OF SERVICE