

Miriam L. Schimmel (State Bar No. 185089)
mschimmel@blackstonepc.com
Joana Fang (State Bar No. 309623)
jfang@blackstonepc.com
Alexandra Rose (State Bar No. 329407)
arose@blackstonepc.com
BLACKSTONE LAW, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 622-4278 / Facsimile: (855) 786-6356

Attorneys for Plaintiff JOSEPH AMYOT, individually,
and on behalf of other similarly situated employees and
aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SHASTA**

JOSEPH AMYOT, individually, and on behalf of
other similarly situated employees and
aggrieved employees pursuant to the California
Private Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SILVERTHORN RESORT, INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 23CV-203487

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT**

- (1) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 (Unpaid Minimum Wages)**
- (2) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime)**
- (3) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Unpaid Meal Period Premiums)**
- (4) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226.7 (Unpaid Rest Period Premiums)**
- (5) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 204 and 210 (Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment)**
- (6) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226(a) (Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements)**
- (7) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 (Untimely Final Wages)**
- (8) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses)**

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

- (9) Violation of Cal. Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* (Unfair and Unlawful Business Practices)**
- (10) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* (California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004)**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff JOSEPH AMYOT (“Plaintiff”), individually, and on behalf of other similarly situated
2 employees and aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act
3 (“PAGA”), alleges as follows against Defendants SILVERTHORN RESORT, INC. and DOES 1
4 through 25, inclusive (collectively, “Defendants”):

5 **INTRODUCTION**

6 1. This is a class action to recover damages on behalf of Plaintiff and all current and
7 former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of
8 California at any time during the period from four years prior to the date of the filing of the original
9 Complaint through final judgment (“Class Members”).

10 2. This is also an enforcement action under PAGA to recover civil penalties on behalf of
11 Plaintiff, the State of California, and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees
12 who worked for Defendants in the State of California at any time from one year prior to Plaintiff’s
13 submission of written notice of Defendants’ alleged violations of the California Labor Code to the
14 Labor & Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) through final judgment (“Aggrieved
15 Employees”).

16 3. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants hired Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved
17 Employees but, among other things, failed to properly pay them all wages owed for all time worked
18 (including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages), failed to provide them with all
19 meal periods and rest periods and associated premium wages to which they were entitled, failed to
20 timely pay them all wages due upon termination of their employment, failed to provide them with
21 accurate wage statements, and failed to reimburse them for necessary business expenses.

22 4. As a result, Defendants violated, *inter alia*, California Labor Code sections 201, 202,
23 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802, and the applicable
24 Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order. Through this action, Plaintiff seeks to recover
25 all available remedies including but not limited to actual and liquidated damages, penalties, and
26 attorneys’ fees and costs.

27 ///

28 ///

1
2 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

3 5. This is a class action brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section
4 382 and a PAGA action brought pursuant to California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*

5 6. The monetary damages, restitution, statutory penalties, and other applicable legal and
6 equitable relief sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and
7 will be established according to proof at trial.

8 7. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution,
9 Article VI, section 10, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all other causes” except
10 those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify
11 any other basis for jurisdiction.

12 8. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and belief,
13 Defendants are either citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or
14 otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of
15 jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and
16 substantial justice. Further, no federal question is at issue because the claims asserted herein are based
17 solely on California law.

18 9. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants
19 maintain offices, have agents, employ individuals, and/or transact business in the State of California,
20 County of Shasta. The majority of the acts, events, and violations alleged herein relating to Plaintiff
21 occurred throughout the state of California, including in the County of Shasta.

22 **THE PARTIES**

23 10. At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff JOSEPH AMYOT is and was an individual
24 residing in Shasta County in the State of California.

25 11. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant SILVERTHORN RESORT, INC. was and is
26 an employer who does business in California, with locations throughout the State of California, and
27 whose employees are engaged throughout Shasta County and the State of California, including at
28 16250 Silverthorn Road, Redding, California 96003.

1 12. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names or capacities of the Defendants sued herein under
2 the fictitious names DOES 1 through 25 but will seek leave of this Court to amend the complaint and
3 serve such fictitiously named Defendants once their names and capacities become known.

4 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and all of the acts and
5 omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to SILVERTHORN RESORT, INC.
6 and/or DOES 1 through 25, each acting as the agent, employee, alter ego, and/or joint venturer of, or
7 working in concert with, each of the other co-Defendants and within the course and scope of such
8 agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity with legal authority to act on the others'
9 behalf. The acts of any and all Defendants represent and were in accordance with Defendants' official
10 policies.

11 14. At all relevant times, Defendants were the employers of Plaintiff within the meaning
12 of all applicable state laws and statutes. Defendants directly or indirectly controlled or affected the
13 working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff so as to make
14 each of said Defendants employers and employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

15 15. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the other Class
16 Members, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff and the other Class Members'
17 employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

18 16. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff
19 and the other Class Members' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and the other
20 Class Members.

21 17. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff and the other Class
22 Members.

23 18. Defendants continue to employ hourly paid and/or non-exempt employees within the
24 State of California.

25 19. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, ratified each and every act or
26 omission complained of herein. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted
27 the acts and omissions of each and all the other Defendants in proximately causing the damages herein
28 alleged.

20. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said Defendants is in some manner intentionally, negligently, or otherwise responsible for the acts, omissions, occurrences, and transactions alleged herein.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

21. Plaintiff worked for Defendants from approximately May 2023 through approximately June 2023 as a Dockhand. Defendants jointly and severally employed Plaintiff based out of their location in Redding, California. Plaintiff performed various duties for Defendants including, among other things, scrubbing boats, cleaning docks, bathtubs, and pumps.

22. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants engaged in a pattern and practice of wage abuse against their hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees. As set forth in more detail below, this pattern and practice of wage abuse involved, *inter alia*, requiring Plaintiff and the Class Members to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to properly pay overtime wages and minimum wages for all hours worked, failing to provide all meal and rest breaks to which they were entitled and failing to pay meal and rest break premiums when due, failing to timely pay wages during employment and upon termination of employment, failing to provide accurate wage statements, failing to reimburse necessary business-related expenses and failing to adhere to other related protections afforded by the California Labor Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order.

23. Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and the Class Members pursuant to California law. Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so to increase Defendant's profits.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

24. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit as a class action on behalf of Plaintiff and all others similarly situated, as members of a proposed class pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The class satisfies the numerosity, commonality, typicality, adequacy, predominance, and superiority requirements under California Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

25. The proposed Class is defined as follows:

All current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California at any time during the period from four years prior to the date of the filing of the original Complaint until final judgment.

26. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish additional subclasses as appropriate.

27. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is easily ascertainable.

28. The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all its members is impracticable. While the exact number and identities of Class Members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time, the exact numbers of Class Members and their identities can be ascertained through appropriate discovery from records maintained by Defendants and their agents.

29. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all Class Members, which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. The common legal and factual questions which do not vary from Class Member to Class Member, and which may be determined without reference to the individual circumstances of any Class Member include, but are not limited to, the following:

- i. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other Class Members for all hours worked;
- ii. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff and the other Class Members for all overtime hours worked;
- iii. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the other Class Members;
- iv. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to provide rest periods to Plaintiff and the other Class Members;
- v. Whether Defendants failed to pay their hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees in the State of California for all hours worked, and for all missed, short, late, and/or interrupted meal periods and rest breaks;

///

- vi. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other Class Members during their employment;
- vii. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;
- viii. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other Class Members within the required time upon their discharge or resignation;
- ix. Whether Defendants failed to comply with wage reporting as required by the California Labor Code, including, *inter alia*, section 226;
- x. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other Class Members for necessary business-related expenses and costs;
- xi. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- xii. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;
- xiii. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and
- xiv. Whether Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

30. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Class, and Plaintiff's interests are coincident with and not antagonistic to those of the other Class Members Plaintiff seeks to represent. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class. Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of class actions and Plaintiff intends to prosecute this action vigorously.

31. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy since individual litigation of the claims of all Class Members is impracticable. Even if every Class Member could afford individual litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly burdensome on the courts in which individual litigation of numerous cases would proceed. Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense to all parties and to the court

1 system resulting from multiple trials of the same complex factual issues. By contrast, the conduct of
2 this action as a class action, with respect to some or all of the issues presented in this Complaint,
3 presents fewer management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and of the court system,
4 and protects the rights of each Class Member.

5 32. Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will advance public policy
6 objectives. Employers of this great state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current
7 employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. However,
8 class actions provide the Class Members who are not named in the complaint anonymity that allows
9 for the vindication of their rights.

10 **PAGA ALLEGATIONS**

11 33. PAGA is and was applicable to Defendants' employment of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
12 Employees.

13 34. PAGA provides that any provision of law under the California Labor Code that
14 provides for a civil penalty, including unpaid wages and premium wages, to be assessed and collected
15 by the LWDA for violations of the California Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through
16 a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or
17 former employees pursuant to procedures outlined in California Labor Code section 2699.3.

18 35. Pursuant to PAGA, a civil action may be brought by an "aggrieved employee," who is
19 any person employed by the alleged violator and against whom one or more of the alleged violations
20 was committed.

21 36. Plaintiff and the other non-exempt employees are "Aggrieved Employees" as defined
22 by California Labor Code section 2699(c) because they are current or former employees of Defendants
23 against whom one of more of the alleged violations were committed.

24 37. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, an aggrieved employee,
25 including Plaintiff, may pursue a civil action arising under PAGA after the following requirements
26 have been met:

27 ///

28 ///

1 a. The aggrieved employee shall give written notice by certified mail (hereinafter
2 “Employee’s Notice”) to the LWDA and the employer of the specific provisions of the
3 California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories
4 to support the alleged violations.

5 b. The LWDA shall provide notice (“LWDA Response”) to the employer and the
6 aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not intend to investigate the alleged
7 violation within sixty (60) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee’s
8 Notice. Upon receipt of the LWDA Response, or if the LWDA Response is not
9 provided within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee’s
10 Notice, the aggrieved employee may commence a civil action pursuant to California
11 Labor Code section 2699 to recover civil penalties in addition to any other penalties to
12 which the employee may be entitled.

13 38. On October 20, 2023, Plaintiff provided notice by electronic submission to the LWDA
14 and by certified mail to Defendants regarding the specific provisions of the California Labor Code
15 alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations,
16 pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.3. **A true and correct copy of the Employee’s**
17 **Notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A.**

18 39. Plaintiff did not receive a LWDA Response within sixty-five (65) calendar days of
19 providing the Employee’s Notice.

20 40. Therefore, the administrative prerequisites under California Labor Code section
21 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendants, in addition to other remedies for violations of,
22 *inter alia*, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d),
23 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802 have been satisfied.

24 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 1194, 1197, AND 1197.1**

26 **Unpaid Minimum Wages**

27 **(Against All Defendants)**

28 ///

1 41. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the
2 allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

3 42. California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 provide that the minimum wage
4 for employees fixed by the IWC is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a
5 wage less than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. Plaintiff and the other Class Members were
6 frequently suffered or permitted to work “off-the-clock”, such that they were not paid minimum wage
7 for all hours worked.

8 43. Such “off-the-clock” work that Plaintiff and Class Members were suffered and/or
9 permitted to work, and for which Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive minimum wage include
10 *inter alia*, requiring Plaintiff and Class Members to (1) attend meetings prior to clocking in and (2) to
11 clean boats and docks after clocking out.

12 44. Moreover, Defendants had a policy, practice, and procedure of rounding employee time
13 such that Plaintiff and some or all Class Members were systematically unpaid and/or underpaid for
14 time worked over the course of their employment.

15 45. Accordingly, Defendants regularly failed to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiff
16 and the other Class Members for all hours they worked in violation of California Labor Code sections
17 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

18 46. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were
19 performing such work “off-the-clock” because, among other things, Defendants’ management
20 witnessed, authorized, was made aware of, and/or required Plaintiff and Class Members to perform
21 such work.

22 47. Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members the minimum wage
23 as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Pursuant to those
24 sections, Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their
25 minimum wage compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorney’s fees.

26 48. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and the other Class
27 Members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully
28 unpaid and interest thereon.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 510 AND 1198
Unpaid Overtime
(Against All Defendants)

49. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

50. California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person's regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily and/or weekly basis.

51. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants were required to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members at the rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh consecutive day in a workweek.

52. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants were required to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members overtime compensation at a rate of two (2) times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day and/or for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day in a workweek.

53. California Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-and-one half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh consecutive day in a workweek, and to overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day and/or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day of work.

54. Plaintiff and the other Class Members regularly worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day, in excess of forty (40) hours in a week, and/or seven (7) consecutive days in a workweek. However, Defendants did not record Plaintiff and the other Class Members' actual hours worked and intentionally and willfully failed to pay all overtime wages owed to Plaintiff and the other Class Members. Defendants' failure to pay correct overtime wages included,

1 *inter alia*: (a) when the combined total of the off-the-clock work discussed *supra* and the on-the-clock
2 work exceed the number of hours that trigger the payment of overtime wages under California Labor
3 Code sections 510 and 1198 and/or the applicable IWC Wage Order; (b) when Defendants
4 intentionally, willfully, and/or negligently mischaracterized overtime as straight time; (c) when
5 Defendants assigned more work than could reasonably be completed in a workday or workweek to
6 Plaintiff and Class Members, but refused to authorize the overtime necessary for them to complete the
7 assigned work; and (d) when Defendants failed to include all required wages and remuneration when
8 calculating setting the overtime rate.

9 55. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members as outlined above
10 violates California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order and is
11 therefore unlawful.

12 56. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiff and the other Class Members
13 are entitled to recover their unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys'
14 fees.

15 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 226.7 AND 512(a)**

17 **Unpaid Meal Break Premiums**

18 **(Against All Defendants)**

19 57. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the
20 allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

21 58. California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order
22 govern Plaintiff and the other Class Members' employment by Defendants.

23 59. California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an
24 employee to work during any meal period mandated by an applicable IWC Order.

25 60. The applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) provide
26 that an employer may not require, cause, or permit an employee to work for a period of more than five
27 (5) hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than thirty (30)
28 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is not more than six (6) hours,

1 the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee.

2 61. The applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) further
3 provides that an employer may not require, cause, or permit an employee to work a work period of
4 more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal
5 period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12)
6 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee
7 only if the first meal period was not waived.

8 62. Plaintiff and the other Class Members who were scheduled to work for shifts no longer
9 than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their legally mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were
10 required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not
11 less than thirty (30) minutes.

12 63. Plaintiff and the other Class Members who were scheduled to work for shifts in excess
13 of ten (10) hours but no longer than twelve (12) hours, and who did not waive their legally-mandated
14 meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without
15 an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

16 64. Defendants intentionally and willfully required Plaintiff and the other Class Members
17 to work during meal periods and failed to compensate Plaintiff and the other Class Members for work
18 performed during meal periods. This includes, among other things, requiring Plaintiff and Class
19 Members to work through their lunch breaks, permitting and/or requiring Plaintiff and Class Members
20 to take late lunch breaks, permitting and/or requiring Plaintiff and Class Members to take short lunch
21 breaks, interrupting and/or allowing others to interrupt Plaintiff and Class Members during their lunch
22 breaks, failing to relieve Plaintiff and Class Members of all duties during their lunch breaks, and
23 restricting Plaintiff and Class Members from leaving the premises during their lunch breaks.

24 65. Further, because of Defendants' rounding policy, meal breaks were at times incorrectly
25 recorded as compliant, when in reality they were untimely and/or cut short.

26 66. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other Class
27 Members all meal period premiums due pursuant to California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512
28 and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

67. Defendants' conduct therefore violates the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

68. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7(b), Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant meal period was not provided.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE § 226.7

Unpaid Rest Period Premiums

(Against All Defendants)

69. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

70. California Labor Code section 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order govern Plaintiff and the other Class Members' employment by Defendants.

71. California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

72. The applicable IWC Wage Order provides that “[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period” and that the “rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof” unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3½) hours.”

73. Defendants routinely required Plaintiff and the other Class Members to work three and one-half (3 ½) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a compliant ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period, or major fraction thereof, worked.

74. Moreover, Defendants willfully required, suffered, and permitted Plaintiff and the other Class Members to work during what should have been their rest periods. Defendants also failed to relieve Plaintiff and the other Class Members of all duties for ten (10) minutes as required for compliant rest breaks.

75. As a result, Plaintiff worked through rest periods, took late rest periods, took interrupted rest periods, and/or took short rest periods, if at all.

76. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7(b), Plaintiff and the other Class Members were entitled to recover from Defendants one (1) additional hour of pay at their regular hourly rate of compensation for each workday that compliant rest period(s) were not provided.

77. Defendants had no policy and/or practice to pay a premium when rest periods were missed, short, late, and/or interrupted, or otherwise failed to comply with California law, and thus Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members the full rest period premium due to them in violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order(s).

78. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) and California Labor Code section 226.7(c), Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday complaint rest period(s) were not provided.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 204 AND 210

Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment

(Against All Defendants)

79. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

80. California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed.

81. California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

82. California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period.

83. As a result of the violations set forth in detail above (failure to pay overtime, failure to pay minimum wages, meal break violations, and rest break violations), Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to timely pay Plaintiff and other Class Members all wages due to them, within the period permissible under California Labor Code section 204.

84. Plaintiff and other Class Members are entitled to recover all available remedies for Defendants' violations of California Labor Code section 204, including statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 210(b).

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE § 226(a)

Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements

(Against All Defendants)

85. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

86. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code section 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of its employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing, including, but not limited to, the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, total hours worked, and all applicable hourly rates.

87. As a result of the violations set forth in detail above (failure to pay overtime, failure to pay minimum wages, meal break violations, and rest break violations), Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the other Class Members with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to state all hours worked, the failure to state the actual gross wages earned, the failure to include meal and rest break premiums, and the failure to include correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Defendants violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

///

///

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

89. Specifically, Plaintiff and the other Class Members have been injured by Defendants' intentional violation of California Labor Code section 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 section 226(a). In addition, because Defendants failed to provide the accurate number of total hours worked on wage statements, Plaintiff and the other Class Members have been prevented by Defendants from determining if all hours worked were paid and the extent of the underpayment. Plaintiff had to file this lawsuit, and will further have to conduct discovery, reconstruct time records, and perform computations in order to analyze whether in fact Plaintiff and the other Class Members were paid correctly and the extent of the underpayment, thereby causing Plaintiff to incur expenses and lost time. Plaintiff would not have had to engage in these efforts and incur these costs had Defendants provided the accurate number of total hours worked. This has also delayed Plaintiff's ability to demand and recover the underpayment of wages from Defendants.

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

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 201, 202, AND 203

Untimely Final Wages

(Against All Defendants)

91. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

92. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203, Defendants are required to timely pay all earned and unpaid wages to an employee who is discharged. California Labor Code section 201 mandates that if an employer discharges an employee, the employee's wages accrued and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202 mandates that if an employee quits, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than

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

93. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, in accordance with California Labor Code sections 201 and 202, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

94. As a result of the violations set forth in detail above (failure to pay overtime, failure to pay minimum wages, meal break violations, and rest break violations), at the time that Plaintiff and the other Class Members' employment with Defendants ended, Defendants knowingly and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members all wages owed to them pursuant to California Labor Code sections 201 and 202, including, without limitation, overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages, and all wages due to Plaintiff and Class Members as they became due, as required per California Labor Code section 204.

95. As a result, Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to all available statutory penalties, including the waiting time penalties provided in California Labor Code section 203, together with interest thereon, as well as other available remedies.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 2800 AND 2802

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses

(Against All Defendants)

96. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

97. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

98. Plaintiff and the other Class Members incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants, including, but not limited to the purchase of water shoes and work uniform for work-related purposes.

99. Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other Class Members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs. Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants their business-related expenses and costs incurred during the course and scope of employment, plus interest accrued from the date on which Plaintiff and the other Class Members incurred the necessary expenditures at the same rate as judgments in civil actions in the State of California.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200, *ET. SEQ.*

Unfair and Unlawful Business Practices

(Against All Defendants)

100. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

101. Each and every one of Defendants' acts and omissions in violation of the California Labor Code and/or the applicable IWC Wage Order as alleged herein, including but not limited to Defendants' failure and refusal to pay overtime compensation, Defendants' failure and refusal to pay minimum wages, Defendants' failure and refusal to provide required meal periods and/or pay meal period premiums, Defendants' failure and refusal to provide required rest periods and/or pay the required rest break premiums, Defendants' failure to timely pay wages at the correct rate during employment, Defendants' failure and refusal to furnish accurate itemized wage statements, Defendants' failure and refusal to reimburse business-related expenses, and Defendants' failure to timely pay wages upon termination constitutes an unfair and unlawful business practice under California Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.*

102. Defendants' violations of California wage and hour laws constitute an unfair and unlawful business practice because Defendants' aforementioned acts and omissions were done repeatedly over a significant period of time, and in a systematic manner, to the detriment of Plaintiff

1 and the other Class Members.

2 103. Defendants have avoided payment of overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period
3 premiums, rest period premiums, timely wages at the correct rate of pay, and other benefits as required
4 by the California Labor Code, the California Code of Regulations, and the applicable IWC Wage
5 Order. Further, Defendants have failed to record, report, and pay the correct sums of assessment to
6 the state authorities under the California Labor Code and other applicable regulations.

7 104. As a result of Defendants' unfair and unlawful business practices, Defendants have
8 reaped unfair and illegal profits during Plaintiff and the other Class Members' tenure at the expense
9 of Plaintiff, the other Class Members, and members of the public. Defendants should be made to
10 disgorge their ill-gotten gains and to restore them to Plaintiff and the other Class Members.

11 105. Defendants' unfair and unlawful business practices entitle Plaintiff and the other Class
12 Members to seek preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, including but not limited to orders that
13 Defendants account for, disgorge, and restore to Plaintiff and the other Class Members the wages and
14 other compensation unlawfully withheld from them. Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled
15 to restitution of all monies to be disgorged from Defendants in an amount according to proof at the
16 time of trial.

17 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE § 2698, *ET SEQ.***

19 **California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004**

20 **(Against All Defendants)**

21 106. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the
22 allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

23 107. Plaintiff brings this action on a representative basis on behalf of other Aggrieved
24 Employees and the State of California, in Plaintiff's capacity as a private attorney general pursuant to
25 the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*

26 108. PAGA expressly provides for a private right of action to recover civil penalties for
27 violations of the California Labor Code as follows: "*Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any*
28 *provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and*

1 *Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies,*
2 *or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action*
3 *brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former*
4 *employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.” Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(a).*

5 109. Whenever the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
6 agencies, or employees has discretion to assess a civil penalty, a court in a civil action is authorized to
7 exercise the same discretion, subject to the same limitations and conditions, to assess a civil penalty.

8 110. Plaintiff and the other non-exempt employees are “Aggrieved Employees” as defined
9 by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees of
10 Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations were committed against them.

11 111. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, violates numerous sections of the California
12 Labor Code, including, but not limited to, the following:

- 13 a. Violation of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 for failure to pay overtime
14 wages, as set forth more fully above;
- 15 b. Violation of California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 for failure to pay
16 minimum wages, as set forth more fully above;
- 17 c. Violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) for failure to provide
18 legally required meal periods, as set forth more fully above;
- 19 d. Violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) for failure to pay
20 required meal period premiums, as set forth more fully above;
- 21 e. Violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 for failure to provide legally required
22 rest periods, as set forth more fully above;
- 23 f. Violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 for failure to pay required rest period
24 premiums, as set forth more fully above;
- 25 g. Violation of California Labor Code section 204 for failure to timely pay wages to
26 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees during employment;
- 27 h. Violation of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 for failure to pay all
28 wages at time of discharge from employment, as set forth more fully above;

- i. Violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) for failure to provide accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, as set forth more fully above;
- j. Violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d) for failure to keep complete and accurate payroll records relating to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees; and
- k. Violation of California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for necessary business-related expenses and costs, as set forth more fully above.

112. Pursuant to PAGA, and in particular California Labor Code sections 2699(a), 2699.3, and 2699.5, Plaintiff, acting in the public interest as a private attorney general, seeks assessment and collection of civil penalties for Plaintiff, all Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California against Defendants for violations of California Labor Code sections set forth herein, including penalties under California Labor Code sections 2699, 558, 210, 1197.1, 226, 226.3, 1174.5, and 1197.1, penalties under the applicable IWC Wage Order, and any and all additional penalties and remedies as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

113. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(i), civil penalties recovered by Aggrieved Employees shall be distributed as follows: seventy-five percent (75%) to the LWDA for the enforcement of labor laws and education of employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities and twenty-five (25%) to the Aggrieved Employees.

114. Plaintiff retained counsel to file this court action, and to assess and collect the civil penalties owed by Defendants. Plaintiff therefore seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210, 218.5, and 2699(g)(1), and any other applicable statute.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff, on behalf of other similarly situated employees and aggrieved employees pursuant to PAGA, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

Class Certification

1. That this action be certified as a class action as to the first nine causes of action;

///

2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class as to the first nine causes of action;

3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel; and

4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel immediately the names and most current/last known contact information (address, e-mail, and telephone numbers) of all Class Members.

As to the First Cause of Action

5. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other Class Members;

6. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

7. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1 for Plaintiff and the other Class Members in the amount as may be established according to proof at trial;

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

9. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194(a);

10. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2; and

11. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Second Cause of Action

12. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due to Plaintiff and the other Class Members;

13. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

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

15. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194; and

1 16. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

2 **As to the Third Cause of Action**

3 17. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor
4 Code sections 226.7 and 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) by willfully failing to provide all
5 meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiff and the other Class Members;

6 18. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other Class Members of one (1) hour
7 of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not
8 provided;

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

10 20. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(c);

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

12 22. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

13 23. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

14 **As to the Fourth Cause Action**

15 24. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor
16 Code section 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) by willfully failing to provide all rest
17 periods to Plaintiff and the other Class Members;

18 25. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other Class Members of one (1) hour
19 of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not
20 provided;

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

22 27. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(c);

23 28. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;
24 and

25 29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

30. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 204 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time required by California Labor Code section 204 to Plaintiff and the Class Members;

31. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 210; and

32. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

33. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code section 226(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) as to Plaintiff and the other Class Members, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

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

35. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(e);

36. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(g); and

37. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

38. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment of Plaintiff and the other Class Members no longer employed by Defendants;

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

40. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for Plaintiff and the other Class Members who have left Defendants' employ;

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

42. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Eight Cause of Action

43. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the other Class Members for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

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

45. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;

46. For punitive damages and/or exemplary damages according to proof at trial;

47. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

48. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

49. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the following California Labor Code sections as to Plaintiff and the other Class Members: 510 and 1198 (by failing to pay overtime wages); 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 (by failing to pay minimum wages); 226.7 and 512(a) (by failing to provide meal and rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof); 204 (by failing to timely pay wages during employment); 226(a) (by failing to provide accurate wage statements); 201, 202, and 203 (by failing to pay all wages owed upon termination); and 2800 and 2802 (by failing to reimburse business-related expenses);

50. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all the other Class Members and all pre-judgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

51. 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 violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;

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

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

///

1 **As to the Tenth Cause of Action**

2 54. For the imposition of civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699,
3 210, 558, 226, 226.3, 1174.5, and 1197.1, and all other penalties allowed by the California Labor Code
4 and/or other applicable statutes;

5 55. For statutory attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to sections 210, 218.5, and 2699(g)(1)
6 of the California Labor Code; and

7 56. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

8
9 Dated: May 8, 2025

BLACKSTONE LAW, APC

10 

11 By:

Alexandra Rose, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiff

12 JOSEPH AMYOT, individually, and on behalf
13 of other similarly situated employees and
14 aggrieved employees pursuant to the California
15 Private Attorneys General Act

1 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

2 Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial with respect to all issues triable of right by jury.

3
4 Dated: May 8, 2025

BLACKSTONE LAW, APC

5 

6 By:

Alexandra Rose, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiff

7 JOSEPH AMYOT, individually, and on behalf
8 of other similarly situated employees and
9 aggrieved employees pursuant to the California
10 Private Attorneys General Act

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I, Karina Hernandez, certify and declare as follows:

I am over eighteen years of age and not a party to the within action; my business address is 8383 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 745, Beverly Hills, California 90211. On May 8, 2025, I served a copy of the following document(s):

FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT

on the interested parties as follows:

John H. Adams, Jr.
LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.
500 Capitol Mall Suite 2000
Sacramento, CA 95814
Tel: 916-830-7200
Emails: jhadams@littler.com
aredding@littler.com
jjhughey@littler.com

Attorneys for Defendant, Silverthorn Resort, Inc.

☒ **BY ELECTRONIC MAIL (E-MAIL):** I caused said document(s) to be delivered electronically to be delivered to the above referenced addressee(s) via email from email address khernandez@blackstonepc.com pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6(e)(1). I did not receive any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

☒ **BY ONLINE SUBMISSION:** The above-referenced documents were transmitted to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency through the online system established for the submission of notices and documents, in conformity with California Labor Code section 2699(I). I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

☒ **STATE:** I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on May 8, 2025 at Beverly Hills, California.

/s/ Karina Hernandez
Karina Hernandez