

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

Bevin Pike (SBN 221936)

bpike@tomorrowlaw.com

Trisha Monesi (SBN 303512)

tmonesi@tomorrowlaw.com

1460 Westwood Boulevard

Los Angeles, California 90024

Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

Per local Rule, This case is assigned to
Judge Reyes, Benjamin T, II, for all purposes.

Attorneys for Plaintiff HEATHER SOMATRA BUTLER,

as an Aggrieved Employee, and on behalf of all other

Aggrieved Employees

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

HEATHER SOMATRA BUTLER, as an
Aggrieved Employee, and on behalf of all other
Aggrieved Employees under the Labor Code
Private Attorneys' General Act of 2004,

Plaintiff

v.

HOKALI, INC., a Delaware corporation; and
DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: C26-02460

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

**COMPLAINT UNDER THE LABOR
CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS'
GENERAL ACT OF 2004 FOR CIVIL
PENALTIES UNDER LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1
and 2699**

[Amount in Controversy Greater Than
\$35,000.00]

1 Plaintiff HEATHER SOMATRA BUTLER (“Plaintiff”), as an Aggrieved Employee, and
2 on behalf of all other Aggrieved Employees under the Labor Code Private Attorneys’ General Act
3 of 2004, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 1. This is a representative action, pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General
6 Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”), against Hokali, Inc., a
7 Delaware corporation, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State
8 of California (“Hokali”), (hereinafter, collectively, with DOES 1 through 100, as further defined
9 below, “Defendants”) as a proxy of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the State of
10 California (“LWDA”), on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees that worked for
11 Defendants during the PAGA Period. Specifically, in connection with any alleged claims for failure
12 to comply with Labor Code sections 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 206.5, 210, 226, 226.3, 1198, including
13 restraints on competition, whistleblowing and freedom of speech and applicable Wage Orders,
14 Plaintiff seeks to represent all current and former employees that worked for Defendants during the
15 PAGA Period. On all other claims mentioned herein, Plaintiff seeks to represent only non-exempt
16 current and former employees that worked for Defendants during the PAGA Period. Collectively,
17 these employees are herein referred to as “Aggrieved Employees.” The “PAGA Period” refers to
18 one year preceding the date notice was submitted to the LWDA, continuing past the date of notice
19 to the LWDA until judgement is entered.

20 **PARTIES**

21 2. Plaintiff HEATHER SOMATRA BUTLER is a resident of the State of California.
22 At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
23 Defendants employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee. Plaintiff worked as a teacher with duties
24 that included, but were not limited to, teaching grades six through eight after school, as well as
25 supervising activities, meals, and homework.

26 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Plaintiff
27 HEATHER SOMATRA BUTLER worked for Defendants from approximately August of 2025
28 through approximately April of 2026.

4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant Hokali is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County of Contra Costa, State of California. At all relevant times herein, Hokali employed Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees within the State of California.

5. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the defendants designated herein as DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known.

JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS

6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each defendant acted in all respects pertinent to this action, as the agent of the other defendant(s), carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally attributable to the other defendants. Whenever, heretofore or hereinafter, reference is made to “Defendants,” it shall include Hokali, and any of their parent, subsidiary, or affiliated companies within the State of California, as well as DOES 1 through 100 identified herein.

7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that all the times mentioned herein, each of the Defendants was the agent, principal, employee, employer, representative, joint venture or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, either actually or ostensibly, and in doing the things alleged herein acted within the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, and conspiracy.

8. All of the acts and conduct described herein of each and every corporate defendant was duly authorized, ordered, and directed by the respective and collective defendant corporate employers, and the officers and management-level employees of said corporate employers. In addition thereto, said corporate employers participated in the aforementioned acts and conduct of

1 their said employees, agents, and representatives, and each of them; and upon completion of the
2 aforesaid acts and conduct of said corporate employees, agents, and representatives, the defendant
3 corporation respectively and collectively ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded,
4 acquiesced, authorized, and otherwise approved of each and all of the said acts and conduct of the
5 aforementioned corporate employees, agents and representatives.

6 9. As a result of the aforementioned facts, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based
7 thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are joint employers.

8 **JURISDICTION**

9 10. Jurisdiction exists in the Superior Court of the State of California pursuant to Code
10 of Civil Procedure section 410.10.

11 11. Venue is proper in Contra Costa County, California pursuant to Code of Civil
12 Procedure sections 392, *et seq.* because, among other things, Contra Costa County is where the
13 causes of action complained of herein arose; the county in which the employment relationship
14 began; the county in which performance of the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff
15 and Defendants was due to be performed; the county in which the employment contract, or part of
16 it, between Plaintiff and Defendants was actually performed; and the county in which Defendants,
17 or some of them, reside. Moreover, the unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff
18 and Aggrieved Employees in Contra Costa County, and Defendants employ Aggrieved Employees
19 in Contra Costa County.

20 **PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ALLEGATIONS**

21 12. Plaintiff is an "Aggrieved Employee" under PAGA, as Plaintiff was employed by
22 Defendants during the PAGA Period and suffered the Labor Code violations set forth herein.
23 Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties under PAGA, plus reasonable attorneys' fees
24 and costs, for Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved Employees of Defendants during the PAGA Period.

25 13. Specifically, Plaintiff seeks to recover PAGA civil penalties through a representative
26 action permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in, among other authorities, *Arias v.*
27 *Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969. According to the same authorities, class certification of the
28 PAGA allegations described herein is not required.

1 14. Labor Code section 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g), authorizes Aggrieved Employees
2 such as Plaintiff to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures specified
3 in Labor Code section 2699.3 on behalf of Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved Employees within the
4 PAGA Period.

5 15. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, on or around May 15, 2026, Plaintiff
6 provided written notice of Defendants' violation of various provisions of the Labor Code to the
7 LWDA online and by certified mail, with return receipt requested, to Defendants ("PAGA Notice").

8 16. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a)(2)(A), the LWDA did not
9 provide notice of its intention to investigate Defendants' alleged violations within sixty-five (65)
10 calendar days of the PAGA Notice.

11 17. To the extent Defendants, or either of them, previously used the notice and cure
12 provision of Labor Code section 2699.3 within the last twelve months, under section 2699.3(d), then
13 Defendants, or those who have availed themselves of the cure provisions validly, are not eligible to
14 cure the violations discussed herein under section 2699.3 or otherwise use the early evaluation
15 conference process pursuant to section 2699.3(f).

16 18. In the event that Defendants, or either of them, is/are determined to have satisfied
17 sections 2699(g), 2699(h), or otherwise 2699(d)(1), Defendants, or any that is determined to have
18 satisfied sections 2699(g), 2699(h), is also, in the alternative, liable for civil penalties pursuant to
19 Labor Code sections 2699(j), 2699(e)(2), and 2699(f)(2).

20 19. In the event that Defendants, or either of them, is/are determined to have, prior to
21 this notice or a request for records pursuant to Labor Code section 226, 432, or 1198.5, from Plaintiff
22 and/or Plaintiff's counsel, adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all
23 provisions identified in this notice, said defendant(s) is/are still liable for civil penalties pursuant to
24 section 2699(g)(1)-(3).

25 20. In the event that Defendants, or either of them is/are deemed to have adequately taken
26 all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice within sixty (60)
27 days of receiving this notice, said defendant(s) is/are still liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor
28 Code section 2699(h)(1)-(3).

21. In the event, the LWDA and/or a court issued a finding or determination to the Defendants, or either of them, that within five (5) years preceding the date of the PAGA Notice the policies or practices which gave rise to the violations alleged herein were unlawful, Defendants, or any of them, would be subject to heightened penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(f)(2)(B)(i), 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3) and **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h) for remedying violations either prior to or after the serving of the PAGA Notice. Regardless, Plaintiff alleges Defendants' conduct giving rise to the violations as detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. Thus, Defendants, or any of them, are further subject to increased penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii) and lack eligibility for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

22. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew, or should have known, that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to receive wages for all time worked, including regular, overtime, and double times wages, and that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not receiving all wages owed for work that was required to be performed.

23. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had and have a policy or practice of requiring Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek (in violation of Labor Code sections 551 and 552) without paying them proper overtime wages.

24. Upon information and belief, Defendants failed to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked by Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees at the proper rates of pay. Defendants also engaged, suffered, or permitted Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, such as communicating with the principal, vice principal, managers, and/or colleagues; and by inaccurately recording time worked due to issues with the time keeping system. For example, Plaintiff had to discuss assignments and duties with the principal and/or vice principal and relay these messages to her manager prior to

1 clocking in. Plaintiff also had to discuss students' behavior with janitors after clocking out, which
2 she was told to relay to her manager the following day.

3 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
4 violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 223, 510, 551, 552, 1197, 1182.12, and applicable
5 Wage Orders based on its continued failure to pay minimum and overtime wages for all hours
6 worked. Thus, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to actual and liquidated
7 damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2, and 1198. Plaintiff is further
8 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such
9 violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendants would also be liable for civil
10 penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1197.1,
11 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Defendants would further
12 be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

13 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants, and
14 each of them, had and have a policy or practice of compelling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
15 Employees during the PAGA Period to work every day in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per
16 day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or
17 compensation in lieu thereof. By way of example, Defendants regularly denied Plaintiff and
18 Aggrieved Employees lawful meal periods by, without limitation, interrupting meal periods; not
19 allowing employees to leave the premises for breaks; failing to provide meal periods all together;
20 not providing timely meal periods. For example, Plaintiff received late meal periods or had to miss
21 her meal period altogether due to issues with understaffing. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
22 Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes,
23 and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated Labor Code sections 512 and 1198 each day for
24 each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed
25 one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period
26 under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Plaintiff is informed and believes that those premium
27 payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made for these non-compliant meal periods,
28 either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties

1 pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for
2 both failing to authorize the taking of compliant meal periods and for failing to provide premium
3 pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k).
4 Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct that
5 gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such, Defendants are
6 further liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

7 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
8 maintain policies or practices of compelling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees every day to,
9 including, without limitation, work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without
10 authorizing and permitting Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted, timely,
11 and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the employees are completely relieved of all of their
12 duties. By way of example, Defendants regularly denied Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees lawful
13 rest periods by, without limitation, by interrupting rest periods; not allowing employees to leave the
14 premises during breaks; by failing to provide rest periods all together; and requiring that rest periods
15 be bundled and taken together and/or with meal periods. For example, Plaintiff was reprimanded
16 for going to her car in the parking lot to grab water, and told she is not allowed to leave the premises.
17 Furthermore, Plaintiff was only provided a "reasonable" amount of time to take a break, but was
18 otherwise required to continue working and assist and/or supervise the children, as Defendant was
19 often understaffed. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations.
20 Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
21 violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA
22 Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular
23 rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7.
24 However, Plaintiff is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section
25 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant rest periods, either at all or at the proper regular
26 rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198. Defendants would thus be liable
27 for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558,
28 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to

1 provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1)
2 and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants'
3 conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such,
4 Defendants are further liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

5 28. As a result of, among other things, Defendants' herein-described policy or practice
6 of failing to: accurately record time; failing to pay overtime and minimum wages; failing to provide
7 meal periods; failing to provide rest periods; and failing to provide compensation in lieu of meal or
8 rest periods, as described above, and due to independent failures in connection therewith, Plaintiff
9 is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants also intentionally failed and
10 continues to fail to furnish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements that
11 accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; the
12 inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; the name of the employee and only the
13 last four digits of their social security number or an employee identification number other than a
14 social security number; all deductions; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
15 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee; the legal name and
16 address of the employer, and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226,
17 subdivision (a). Specifically, Defendants intentionally failed to furnish employees with itemized
18 wage statements that accurately reflect the hours worked by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
19 Employees and the rates of pay at which they were or should have been paid including due to failure
20 to pay at the proper regular rate, thus resulting in a failure to reflect gross and net wages earned and
21 paid at each rate, as well. Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon
22 alleges, that Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226, and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved
23 Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Plaintiff and each Aggrieved Employee
24 personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 226 for each
25 pay period worked during the PAGA Period. Plaintiff is informed and believes that those penalties
26 under Labor Code section 226 were not paid for these violations of Labor Code section 226.
27 Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558,
28 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further

1 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such
2 violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Thus, Defendants would further be liable
3 for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

4 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants also
5 willfully or intentionally failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to timely pay
6 compensation to Plaintiff and other terminated or resigned employees, including but not limited to,
7 failing to pay all overtime wages owed; all minimum wages; and all premium pay owed, as set forth
8 above, among other things. Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon
9 alleges, that Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202 203, and 1198 each pay period for
10 each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and thus Plaintiff and each Aggrieved
11 Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section
12 203 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. However, Plaintiff is informed and
13 believes that those penalties under Labor Code section 203 were not made for these violations of
14 Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant
15 to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and
16 2699(j). Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants'
17 conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such,
18 Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
19 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

20 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants also
21 failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without
22 limitation, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for their costs incurred
23 for the purchase of school supplies and snacks for the children, tools and safety equipment, and the
24 use of personal cellular phone for work purposes, in direct consequence of the discharge of their
25 duties, or of their obedience to the directions of Defendants, as required by Labor Code sections
26 1198, 2800, 2802, and other statutory and common law offenses. As a result, Plaintiff and other
27 Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Defendants are liable to
28 reimburse Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for these costs incurred in furtherance of work

1 duties. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558,
2 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further
3 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such
4 violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such, Defendants would further be liable
5 for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

6 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants had and
7 have a policy or practice of failing to pay Aggrieved Employees their wages in accordance with
8 Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days,
9 inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during
10 which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of
11 any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Plaintiff
12 is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants did not and do not pay Plaintiff
13 and other Aggrieved Employees all wages owed every day and every workweek in accordance with
14 Labor Code sections 204 and 1198. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges,
15 that Defendants violated Labor Code section 204 and that Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees
16 have personally suffered these violations. As such, Defendants would be liable for civil penalties
17 pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections
18 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
19 Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or
20 oppressive. Therefore, Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code
21 section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

22 32. In addition to the above, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges
23 that Defendants failed and continue to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage
24 statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to
25 obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code
26 section 1198.5, time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Plaintiff and
27 other Aggrieved Employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Plaintiff and
28 the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, which in turn would entitle Plaintiff

1 and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5.
2 Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5,
3 and 2699. Plaintiff further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants'
4 conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendants
5 would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

6 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
7 required or require the execution of a release of claim or right on account of wages due, or to become
8 due, or made as an advance on wages to be earned, including, without limitation, as a condition of
9 being paid, to execute a statement of the hours worked during a pay period in which Defendants
10 knew to be false. For example, the time keeping system, TriNet, included a box that Aggrieved
11 Employees were required to check which contained a release of claims for wages due As such,
12 Plaintiff is informed and believe, and based thereon alleges that Defendants violated Labor Code
13 sections 206.5 and 1198, and that Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered
14 these violations. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
15 Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or
16 oppressive. Defendants would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and
17 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Defendants would further be liable
18 for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

19 34. Plaintiff, in Plaintiff's representative capacity, seeks civil penalties under Labor
20 Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699 for the herein-described acts, which violate
21 the California Labor Code as described above, including on behalf of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
22 Employees pursuant to PAGA.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FIRST AND ONLY CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys' General Act (2004) – Against All Defendants)**

3 35. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations set forth in the
4 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

5 **Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 210**

6 36. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 204, requires and required that:
7 “[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for
8 between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor
9 performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for
10 between the 1st and 10th day of the following month.”

11 37. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a) states and stated
12 that “[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this
13 article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3,
14 204, 204b, 204.1, 205, 205.5, and 1197.5, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any
15 initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee” and “(2) For
16 each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for
17 each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.”

18 38. At all relevant times herein, Defendants have had a consistent policy or practice of
19 failing to pay Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees during their employment on a timely basis as
20 per Labor Code section 204 including, without limitation, for the reasons and in a manner set forth
21 in the preceding paragraphs. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 210, Plaintiff and other
22 Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover as civil penalties injunctive relief and monetary civil
23 penalties in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial
24 violation per employee, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus
25 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent
26 violation in connection with each payment that was made in violation of Labor Code section 204.

27 ///

28 ///

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

2
3
4
5
6

7
8

9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6

7
8
9
0
1

2

3

4

5

6

7
8

1 to recover underpaid wages;

2 (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid
3 employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to
4 an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages;

5 (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee.”

6 44. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants, and
7 each of them, violated, or caused to be violated, the Labor Code sections and Wage Orders
8 regulating wages, hours and days of work described herein, including but not limited to Labor Code
9 sections 201-204, 223, 226.7, 510, 511, 512, 551, 552, 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2802.

10 45. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
11 pursuant to Labor Code section 558, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover
12 civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount fifty dollars
13 (\$50) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars
14 (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

15 Violation of Labor Code § 1174.5

16 46. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (b) has
17 required every person employing labor in California to “[a]llow any member of the commission or
18 the employees of the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement free access to the place of business
19 or employment of the person to secure any information or make any investigation that they are
20 authorized by this chapter to ascertain or make. The commission may inspect or make excerpts,
21 relating to the employment of employees, from the books, reports, contracts, payrolls, documents,
22 or papers of the person.”

23 47. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (c) has required
24 every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep a record showing the names and addresses of
25 all employees employed and the ages of all minors.”

26 48. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d) has required
27 every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep, at a central location in the state or at the
28 plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours

1 worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and applicable
2 piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records
3 shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any
4 case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee
5 from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units
6 earned.”

7 49. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, “[a]ny person employing labor who willfully
8 fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of [Labor Code] Section 1174 or accurate
9 and complete records required by subdivision (d) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, or to allow any
10 member of the commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to subdivision
11 (b) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).

12 50. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants have
13 willfully failed to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar
14 payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment
15 under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records
16 under Labor Code section 1174.

17 51. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
18 pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
19 recover civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of five
20 hundred dollars (\$500) per violation per pay period per Aggrieved Employee.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 Violation of Labor Code § 1197.1

2 52. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, subdivision (a): “Any employer or other
3 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, who pays
4 or causes to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or
5 local law, or by an order of the commission shall be subject to a civil penalty, restitution of wages,
6 liquidated damages payable to the employee, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
7 Section 203 as follows:

8 (1) For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars
9 (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
10 employee is underpaid. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
11 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
12 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

13 (2) For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty
14 dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
15 employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is
16 intentionally committed. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
17 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
18 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

19 (3) Wages, liquidated damages, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
20 Section 203, recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected
21 employee.”

22 53. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants caused
23 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees not to be paid minimum wages as a result of Defendants
24 routinely failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked by Plaintiff and
25 Aggrieved Employees at the proper rates of pay, as described above.

26 54. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
27 pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
28 recover civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of one

1 hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and
2 two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each
3 subsequent violation.

4 Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 2699

5 55. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), notwithstanding any other
6 provision of law, any provision of the Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed
7 and collected by the LWDA or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or
8 employees for a violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil
9 action brought by an Aggrieved Employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former
10 employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

11 56. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and
12 each of them, violated the Labor Code sections described in the preceding paragraphs.

13 57. As such, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to injunctive relief, one
14 hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee for each pay period in the PAGA Period, and
15 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each Aggrieved Employee for each pay period in the PAGA Period
16 to the extent Defendants' conduct is found to be malicious, fraudulent and/or oppressive.

17 58. Moreover, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees within the State of California
18 whom Plaintiff seeks to represent are entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in
19 connection with their herein-described claims for civil penalties.

20 **PRAYER**

21 **WHEREFORE**, on behalf of Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff prays for
22 judgment against Defendants as follows:

- 23 A. An award of civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558,
24 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
- 25 B. An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections
26 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
- 27 C. For equitable, including, without limitation, injunctive relief;
- 28 C. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;

D. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

E. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: July 22, 2026

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

BY: /s/ Bevin Pike

BEVIN PIKE

Attorneys for Plaintiff HEATHER
SOMATRA BUTLER and on behalf of all
other Aggrieved Employees