

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)
Eric D. Tims, Esq. (SBN 342 617)
Angel Ransby, Esq. (SBN 355146)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
jklein@lelawfirm.com
etims@lelawfirm.com
aransby@lelawfirm.com

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
7/13/2026 1:15 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By P. Rodriguez, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff APRIL D. VEGTEL,
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees

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

APRIL D. VEGTEL, on behalf of herself and
current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

COASTAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
FOUNDATION DBA WESTSIDE REGIONAL
CENTER; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **26ST CV 22141**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF APRIL D. VEGTEL'S
COMPLAINT FOR:**

- CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT
TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT OF 2004
("PAGA"), LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

COMES NOW Plaintiff APRIL D. VEGTEL ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains
against Defendants COASTAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FOUNDATION DBA WESTSIDE
REGIONAL CENTER; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive (collectively "Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*
("PAGA") representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California, herself
and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-exempt

1 employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated with
2 Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all hours
3 worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure to pay
4 overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay; failure to authorize or permit all legally required
5 and/or compliant meal periods or pay meal period premium wages; failure to authorize or permit
6 all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or pay rest period premium wages; indemnification
7 for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by employees in direct consequence of discharging
8 their duties; failure to pay wages for accrued paid sick time at the regular rate of pay; statutory
9 penalties for failure to timely pay earned wages during employment; statutory penalties for failure
10 to provide accurate wage statements. Plaintiff experienced these violations personally, as well as is
11 informed and believes other aggrieved employees did as well. Plaintiff seeks on a representative
12 basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable
13 attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff,
14 the State of California, and others aggrieved.

15 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

16 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
17 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
18 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
19 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of thirty-five thousand dollars
20 (\$35,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
21 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
22 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
23 California, including but not limited to Los Angeles County, at 777 South Aviation Suite 105, El
24 Segundo, CA 90245.

25 **III. PARTIES**

26 3. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
27 Development Agency on behalf of herself and other current and former employees subject to
28 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is

1 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work
2 for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
3 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently
4 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by
5 Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Los Angeles County employee since in
6 or about March 10, 2025.

7 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant COASTAL
8 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FOUNDATION DBA WESTSIDE REGIONAL CENTER is
9 authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business in the State of
10 California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant hereto were persons
11 acting on behalf of Defendant COASTAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FOUNDATION DBA
12 WESTSIDE REGIONAL CENTER in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned
13 illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant COASTAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
14 FOUNDATION DBA WESTSIDE REGIONAL CENTER operates in Los Angeles County and
15 employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County, including but not limited to,
16 at 777 South Aviation Suite 105, El Segundo, CA 90245.

17 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 1
18 through 50 are corporations, or are other business entities or organizations of a nature unknown to
19 Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California non-exempt employees, permitted
20 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised control over the wages, hours and working
21 conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

22 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 51
23 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each of the individual defendants is sued
24 individually and in his or her capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner, representative, manager,
25 supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant who violated or caused to be
26 violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor Code and/or any provision of the
27 Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

28 7. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100. Plaintiff

1 sues said defendants by said fictitious names, and will amend this complaint when the true names
2 and capacities are ascertained or when such facts pertaining to liability are ascertained, or as
3 permitted by law or by the Court. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously
4 named defendants is in some manner responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this
5 complaint.

6 8. Plaintiff makes the allegations in this complaint without any admission that, as to
7 any particular allegation, Plaintiff bears the burden of pleading, proving, or persuading and Plaintiff
8 reserves all of Plaintiff's right to plead in the alternative.

9 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**
11 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

12 **(Against all Defendants by Plaintiff on behalf of Themselves, the State of California, and**
13 **Other Current and Former Aggrieved Employees)**

14 9. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

15 10. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges
16 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 2802,
17 6401.7, 6401.9, and the applicable Wage Orders.

18 11. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California
19 Labor Code:

20 12. **Failure to pay wages for all hours worked at the legal minimum wage:**
21 Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt
22 employees. In California, an employer is required to pay hourly employees for all "hours worked,"
23 which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the employee
24 is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either directly or
25 indirectly, performing services which inure to the benefit of the employer.

26 13. Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 require an employer to compensate employees
27 for all "hours worked" at least at a minimum wage rate of pay as established by the IWC and the
28 Wage Orders.

1 14. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
2 non-exempt employees worked more minutes per shift than Defendants credited them with having
3 worked. Specifically, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
4 California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages at the applicable minimum wage for all
5 hours worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited
6 to:

7 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
8 non-exempt employees to remain on-duty after clocking- out for their meal breaks resulting in
9 untimely uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes for every five hours worked.

10 15. Therefore, Defendants suffered, permitted, and required Plaintiff and other current
11 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to be subject to Defendants'
12 control without paying wages for that time. This resulted in Plaintiff and other current and former
13 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees working time for which they were not
14 compensated any wages, in violation of Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 and the applicable
15 Wage Order.

16 16. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant's
17 conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendant
18 would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

19 17. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay**
20 **and/or failure to pay overtime wages at the proper rate of pay:** Defendants employed many of
21 their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt employees. In California, an employer
22 is required to pay hourly employees for all "hours worked," which includes all time that an employee
23 is under control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered and permitted to work. This
24 includes the time an employee spends, either directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to
25 the benefit of the employer.'

26 18. Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 require an employer to compensate employees a
27 higher rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, in excess of forty (40)
28 hours in a workweek, and on any seventh consecutive day of work in a workweek:

Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40) hours in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-one-half (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve (12) hours in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an employee.

Labor Code section 510.

19. In this case, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees overtime wages for all overtime hours worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to:

(a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to remain on-duty after clocking- out for their meal breaks resulting in untimely uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes for every five hours worked.

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

21. Furthermore, overtime is based upon an employee's regular rate of pay. "The regular rate at which an employee is employed shall be deemed to include all remuneration for employment paid to, or on behalf, of the employee." *See* Division of Labor Standards Enforcement – Enforcement Policies and Interpretations Manual, Section 49.1.2.

22. In this case, Plaintiff alleges that when she and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees earned overtime wages, Defendants failed to pay them overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay due to Defendants' failure to include all remuneration when calculating the overtime rate of pay. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as "Bonus" for example, when calculating Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying overtime.

23. The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt

1 employees were under the control of Defendants but were not compensated. To the extent that the
2 foregoing uncompensated time occurred when Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
3 California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday,
4 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendants failed
5 to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code
6 sections 510, 1194 and 1198, and the applicable Wage Order.

7 24. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
8 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant meal periods and/or failure to**
9 **pay period premium wages:** Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
10 hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked shifts of more than five (5) hours in length and
11 shifts of more than ten (10) hours in length.

12 25. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an
13 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of
14 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the
15 employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 4 at §11;
16 *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ
17 an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee
18 with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh
19 hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period
20 shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. A paid "on duty" meal
21 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved
22 of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

23 26. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
24 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay
25 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
26 sections 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 4 at §11.

27 27. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit legally required and compliant
28 meal periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-

1 exempt employees due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures, including but not
2 limited to:

3 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
4 non-exempt employees to remain on-duty after clocking- out for their meal breaks resulting in
5 untimely uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes for every five hours worked;

6 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
7 hourly non-exempt employees a second uninterrupted duty-free meal period of no less than thirty
8 (30) minutes for each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
9 based hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

10 28. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
11 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
12 hourly non-exempt employees one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday that
13 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees did
14 not receive legally required and compliant meal periods, in violation of Labor Code section 226.7.

15 29. Finally, on occasions when Defendants paid Plaintiff and other current and former
16 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a "premium" wage for late, missed, short,
17 on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted meal periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1) additional
18 hour of pay at Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
19 exempt employees' regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy,
20 practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as "Bonus" for example, when
21 calculating Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
22 employees' regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying meal period premium wages.

23 30. Defendants' foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff and
24 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not receiving
25 wages to compensate them for workdays during which Defendants did not provide them with meal
26 periods in compliance with California law.

27 31. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant's
28 conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendant

1 would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

2 32. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
3 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant rest periods and/or failure to pay**
4 **rest period premium:** Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
5 non-exempt employees regularly worked shifts of more than three-and-a-half (3.5) hours.

6 33. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
7 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor Code
8 section 226.7; Wage Order 4 at §12. Under California law, “[e]mployees are entitled to 10 minutes’
9 rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six
10 hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on.” *Brinker*
11 *Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code section 226.7;
12 Wage Order 4 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each work period.
13 Wage Order 4 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement ““obligates employers to permit –
14 and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*
15 (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all
16 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

17 34. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer must
18 pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday the
19 employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7; Wage
20 Order 4 at § 12.

21 35. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit all legally required and
22 compliant rest periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
23 non-exempt employees due to Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not
24 limited to:

25 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
26 hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours worked
27 or major fraction thereof;

28 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based

1 hourly non-exempt employees a third uninterrupted duty-free rest period of no less than ten (10) net
2 minutes on each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
3 hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

4 36. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
5 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
6 hourly non-exempt employees with one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday
7 they did not receive legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor Code section
8 226.7.

9 37. Finally, on occasions when Defendants did pay Plaintiff and other current and former
10 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a “premium” wage for late, missed, short,
11 on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted rest periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1) additional
12 hour of pay at Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
13 exempt employees’ regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy,
14 practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all *remuneration such “Bonus”* for example, when
15 calculating Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
16 employees’ regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying rest period premiums.

17 38. Defendants’ foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff and
18 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not receiving
19 wages to compensate them for workdays in which Defendants did not provide them with rest periods
20 in compliance with California law.

21 39. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant’s
22 conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendant
23 would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

24 40. **Failure to Indemnify for Losses and Expenditures Incurred as Part of**
25 **Employment:** California law requires that every employer must indemnify its employees for all
26 necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in discharge of his or her duties or at the
27 obedience of the directions of the employer. Moreover, an employer is prohibited from passing the
28 ordinary business expenses and losses of the employer onto the employee. (Lab. Code, § 2802.)

1 41. Defendants have violated Labor Code Section 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiff
2 and other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees' necessary
3 expenditures they incurred in the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendants employed
4 policies, practices, and/or procedures included, but not limited to:

5 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
6 non-exempt employees the use of their personal cell phone (including both telephone use and
7 cellular data use) for work-related purposes - without reimbursing Plaintiff and other current and
8 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees for such use;

9 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
10 non-exempt employees to purchase uniform for work-related purposes - without reimbursing
11 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees for
12 such use.

13 42. Moreover, Defendants employed policies and procedures which ensured Plaintiff and
14 aggrieved employees would not receive indemnification for their employment related expenses.
15 This practice resulted in Plaintiff and aggrieved employees not receiving such indemnification in
16 compliance with California law.

17 43. Therefore, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for their
18 employment related expenses, including but not limited to costs related to use of their personal cell
19 phones and costs associated with their uniforms pursuant to Labor Code section 2802.

20 44. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant's
21 conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendant
22 would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

23 45. **Failure to provide sick pay wages:** Defendants had a policy and/or procedure where
24 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
25 accrued paid sick time.

26 46. Labor Code section 246, subdivision (a), states in relevant part "[a]n employee
27 who...works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the
28 commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days." Additionally, an employee accrues

1 paid sick days at the rate of no-less-than one (1) hour per every thirty (30) hours worked, beginning
2 at the commencement of employment. Labor Code section 246(b).

3 47. Here, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
4 exempt employees were employed by Defendants for 30 or more days and were entitled to paid sick
5 days. Defendants, however, lacked a policy, practice, and/or procedure whereby Plaintiffs and other
6 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees who were employed
7 by Defendants for 30 days or more could accrue paid sick days at the rate of no-less-than one (1)
8 hour per every thirty (30) hours worked, beginning at the commencement of employment as required
9 by Labor Code section 246(b).

10 48. In this case, Plaintiff alleges that when she and other current and former aggrieved
11 California-based hourly non-exempt employees elected to use paid sick time, Defendants failed to
12 pay them sick time wages at the proper sick time rate of pay due to Defendants' failure to include
13 all remuneration when calculating the sick time rate of pay. Specifically, Defendants maintained a
14 policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration including but not limited to
15 "Bonus" for example, when calculating Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
16 based hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying sick time.

17 49. Defendants' foregoing policy, practice, and/or procedure resulted in Defendants
18 failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
19 exempt employees' paid sick days, in violation of Labor Code section 246.

20 50. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
21 Defendant would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
22 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

23 51. **Failure to timely pay earned wages during employment:** In California, wages
24 must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the
25 employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code section 204(a). Wages earned
26 between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 16th and
27 the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any
28 calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. *Id.* Other payroll

1 periods such as those that are weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly, must be paid within seven (7)
2 calendar days following the close of the payroll period in which wages were earned. Labor Code
3 section 204(d).

4 52. As a derivative of Plaintiff's claims above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to
5 timely pay Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
6 employees' earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages
7 and/or rest period premium wages), in violation of Labor Code section 204. Defendants'
8 aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in their failure to pay Plaintiff's and
9 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' their earned
10 wages within the applicable time frames outlined in Labor Code section 204.

11 53. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
12 Defendant would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
13 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

14 54. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
15 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
16 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
17 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by
18 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful
19 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,
20 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor
21 Code section 1198, the Defendant secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while
22 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

23 55. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
24 Defendant would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
25 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

26 56. **Failure to Establish, Implement, and Maintain a Workplace Violence and**
27 **Injury Prevention Program in Compliance with Labor Code Sections 6401.7 and 6401.9:**
28 California Labor Code Section 6401.7 requires every employer to establish, implement, and

1 maintain an effective injury prevention program. California Labor Code Section 6401.9 requires
2 California employers to adopt a comprehensive Workplace Violence Prevention Plan (WVPP), train
3 employees on workplace violence, log safety incidents, and conduct periodic inspections to evaluate
4 workplace violence hazards.

5 Plaintiff alleges that Defendant did not comply with Defendant's responsibilities and duties
6 under Labor Code sections 6401.7 and 6401.9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges
7 that Defendant (1) failed to establish, implement, and maintain an effective injury prevention
8 program; (2) failed to adopt a compliant Workplace Violence Prevention Plan; (3); failed to train
9 Employee and other aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees in workplace
10 violence and injury prevention; (4) failed to log safety incidents; and (5) failed to conduct compliant
11 periodic inspections. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional. Plaintiff also
12 believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendant would further be liable
13 for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

14 57. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section
15 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an employee
16 his or her wages, the employer must "furnish each of his or her employees ... an itemized statement
17 in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any
18 employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
19 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare
20 Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
21 is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all deductions made on written orders
22 of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive
23 dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her
24 social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all
25 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
26 worked at each hourly rate by the employee."

27 58. As a derivative of Plaintiff's allegations above, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff
28 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages

1 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period
2 premium wages) rendered Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based
3 hourly non-exempt employees' wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section
4 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

5 59. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

6 60. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
7 Defendant would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
8 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 **WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HERSELF AND ON OTHER AGGRIEVED**
11 **EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:**

12 **ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:**

13 1. That Defendants be found to have violated the provisions of the Labor Code and the
14 IWC Wages Orders as to the Plaintiff and aggrieved employees;

15 2. For any and all legally applicable penalties during the relevant statute of limitations
16 subject to any permissible tolling, including but not limited to those recoverable under the California
17 Labor Code, including but not limited to sections 210, 225.5, 226.3, 558, 2699(f);

18 3. For attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including but not limited to those recoverable
19 under California Labor Code section 2699(g); and

20 4. For such and other further relief, in law and/or equity, as the Court deems just or
21 appropriate.

22 Dated: July 13, 2026

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

23
24 By:



Joseph Lavi, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.
Eric D. Tims, Esq.
Angel Ransby, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
APRIL D. VEGTEL, on behalf of herself and current
and former aggrieved employees