Electronically Filed Superior Court of CA County of Contra Costa 10/9/2026 1:35 PM By: L. Smith, Deputy

Tara Zabehi (SBN 314706)
tara@calljustice.com
Lina Yaghoubi (SBN 361377)
l.yaghoubi@calljustice.com
LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203
Tel: (818) 265-1020
Fax: (818) 265-1021

Michael A. Sigall (SBN 305849)
michael.sigall@forthepeople.com
MORGAN & MORGAN CALIFORNIA LLP
633 W. 5th Street, Suite 2200
Los Angeles, California 90071
Tel: (213) 757-6003
Fax: (213) 418-3909

Attorneys for Plaintiff, the Putative Class, and Aggrieved Employees

MORGAN & MORGAN

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

KIMMISHA JAMES, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated and on behalf of the State of California and other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act;

Plaintiff,

vs.

MB LUM, LLC, a California limited liability company; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: C26-01600

Honorable Benjamin T. Reyes, II
Department 16

FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES & ENFORCEMENT UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT, CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 2698, ET SEQ.

(1) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime);
(2) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Unpaid Meal Period Premiums);
(3) Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 (Unpaid Rest Period Premiums);
(4) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 (Unpaid Minimum Wages);
(5) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 (Final Wages Not Timely Paid);
(6) Violation of California Labor Code

Processed by Court on 10/12/2026 10:02 AM

§ 204 (Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment);
(7) Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) (Non-Compliant Wage Statements);
(8) Violation of California Labor Code § 1174(d) (Failure To Keep Requisite Payroll Records);
(9) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Unreimbursed Business Expenses);
(10) Violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, et seq.
(11) Violation of California Labor Code § 2698, et seq. (California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004)

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMES NOW, Plaintiff KIMMISHA JAMES ("Plaintiff"), individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated and on behalf of the State of California and other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorney General Act, and alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants (as defined below) for California Labor Code violations, civil penalties under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq*., and unfair business practices stemming from Defendants' failure to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failure to provide meal periods and rest periods, failure to provide one (1) day's rest in seven (7), failure to pay reporting time pay, failure to timely pay wages during employment and upon separation from employment, failure to furnish accurate itemized wage statements, failure to keep requisite payroll records, and failure to reimburse necessary business-related expenses.

2. Plaintiff brings the First through Tenth Causes of Action individually and as a class action on behalf of herself and certain current and former employees of Defendants (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Class" or "Class Members," and defined more fully below).

MORGAN & MORGAN

3. Plaintiff brings the Eleventh Cause of Action as a representative action under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq*., to recover civil penalties owed to Plaintiff, the State of California, and all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked for any of the Defendants within the State of California during the relevant time period (the "PAGA Period") (hereinafter referred to as the "Aggrieved Employees").

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This class and representative action is brought pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq*. The monetary damages, restitution, and civil penalties sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

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

6. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant because, upon information and belief, Defendant is a citizen of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avails itself of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

7. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendant maintains offices, has agents, employs individuals, and/or transacts business in the State of California, County of Contra Costa. The majority of acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees took place in the State of California, including the County of Contra Costa. At all relevant times, Defendant maintained its headquarters/"nerve center" within the State of California, County of Contra Costa.

MORGAN & MORGAN

PARTIES

8. Plaintiff KIMMISHA JAMES is an individual residing in the State of California, County of Contra Costa.

9. Defendant MB LUM, LLC, at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, a California limited liability company and an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of Contra Costa.

10. At all relevant times, Defendant MB LUM, LLC was the "employer" of Plaintiff within the meaning of all applicable California laws and statutes.

11. At all times herein relevant, Defendants MB LUM, LLC and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, were the agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators, and/or assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto, were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators, and/or assigns, and all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization, and/or consent of each defendant designated as a DOE herein.

12. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual, or otherwise, of defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff who sues said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon, alleges that each of the defendants designated as a DOE is legally responsible for the events and happenings referred to in this Complaint and unlawfully caused the injuries and damages to Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged in this Complaint. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to show the true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

13. Defendant MB LUM, LLC and DOES 1 through 100 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as "Defendants."

14. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants directly or indirectly controlled or

MORGAN & MORGAN

affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff and the other class members and aggrieved employees so as to make each of said Defendants employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

15. Plaintiff brings this action on her own behalf and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated and, thus, seeks class certification under California Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

16. The proposed class is defined as follows:

> All current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked for any of the Defendants within the State of California at any time during the period from May 11, 2022 to final judgment.

17. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish subclasses as appropriate.

18. The class is ascertainable, and there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation:

a. Numerosity: The class members are so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable. The membership of the entire class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, the class is estimated to be greater than fifty (50) individuals, and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment records.

b. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of all other class members' as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the other class members with whom she has a well-defined community of interest.

c. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of each class member, with whom she has a well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no interest that is antagonistic to the other class members. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing

MORGAN & MORGAN

class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and during the pendency of this action will continue to incur, costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder of all class members is impractical.

e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. However, class actions provide the class members who are not named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights.

19. There are common questions of law and fact as to the class members that predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The following common questions of law or fact, among others, exist as to the members of the class:

a. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code was willful;

b. Whether Defendants had a corporate policy and practice of failing to pay their hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California for all hours worked and missed (short, late, interrupted, and/or missed altogether) meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law;

c. Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class members to work over eight (8) hours per day and/or over forty (40) hours per week and failed to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiff and the other class members;

MORGAN & MORGAN

d. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the other class members of meal and/or rest periods or required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during meal and/or rest periods without compensation;

e. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members for all hours worked;

f. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members within the required time upon their discharge or resignation;

g. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members during their employment;

h. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the California Labor Code, including, *inter alia*, section 226;

i. Whether Defendants kept complete and accurate payroll records as required by the California Labor Code, including, *inter alia*, section 1174(d);

j. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs;

k. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;

l. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.;

m. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and

n. Whether Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

PAGA ALLEGATIONS

20. At all times herein set forth, California Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") was applicable to Plaintiff's employment by Defendants.

21. At all times herein set forth, PAGA provides that any provision of law under the

MORGAN & MORGAN

California Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") for violations of the California Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself and other current or former employees pursuant to procedures outlined in California Labor Code section 2699.3.

22. Pursuant to PAGA, a civil action under PAGA may be brought by an "aggrieved employee," who is any person that was employed by the alleged violator and against whom the alleged violations were committed.

23. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants, and the alleged violations were committed against her during her time of employment, and she is, therefore, an aggrieved employee. Plaintiff and the other employees are "aggrieved employees" as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are current or former employees of Defendants, and the alleged violations were committed against them. Plaintiff is an "aggrieved employee" within the meaning of California Labor Code section 2699(c)(1) in that she was employed by Defendants in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately December 2025 to approximately April 2026 and personally suffered each of the violations alleged herein during the PAGA Period.

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

a. The aggrieved employee shall give written notice by online submission (hereinafter, "Employee's Notice") to the LWDA and by certified mail to the employer of the specific provisions of the alleged California Labor Code violations, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.

b. The LWDA shall provide notice (hereinafter, "LWDA Notice") to the employer and the aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not intend to investigate the alleged violations within sixty (60) calendar

MORGAN & MORGAN

days of the postmark date of the Employee's Notice. Upon receipt of the LWDA Notice, or if the LWDA Notice is not provided within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee's Notice, the aggrieved employee may commence a civil action pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699 to recover civil penalties, in addition to any other penalties to which the employee may be entitled.

25. On May 8, 2026, Plaintiff provided written notice by online submission to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendant MB LUM, LLC of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. Plaintiff did not receive an LWDA Notice within sixty-five (65) days of the date of Plaintiff's notice. Plaintiff has not received any notice of Defendants' intention to cure the alleged violations. Plaintiff's certified mail notice to Defendant MB LUM, LLC was postmarked on May 8, 2026. Plaintiff paid the filing fee required by California Labor Code section 2699.3(a)(1)(B).

26. Therefore, Plaintiff has satisfied the administrative prerequisites under California Labor Code section 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendants for violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, including, inter alia, Wage Orders 4-2001, 5-2001, and 15-2001.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

27. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California, including the County of Contra Costa.

28. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately December 2025 to approximately April 2026 in the State of California, County of Contra Costa.

29. Defendants hired Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees, classified them as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees, and failed to compensate them for all

MORGAN & MORGAN

hours worked and missed meal periods and/or rest breaks.

30. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff's, the Class Members', and the Aggrieved Employees' employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

31. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's, the Class Members', and the Aggrieved Employees' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees.

32. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees.

33. Defendants continue to employ hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California.

34. Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees worked over eight (8) hours in a day and/or forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.

35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants engaged in a pattern and practice of wage abuse against their hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California. This pattern and practice involved, *inter alia*, failing to pay them for all regular and/or overtime wages earned and for missed meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law.

36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation and that they were not receiving accurate overtime compensation for all overtime hours worked.

37. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees all required rest and meal periods during the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Orders, and, thus, they are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

MORGAN & MORGAN

38. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's, the Class Members', and the Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, and they did not receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's, the Class Members', and the Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed.

39. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's, the Class Members', and the Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, and they did not receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's, the Class Members', and the Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed.

40. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive at least minimum wages for compensation and that they were not receiving at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

41. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including overtime and minimum wages and meal and rest period premiums, and they did not receive all such wages owed to them at the time of their discharge or resignation.

42. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all wages owed to them during their employment. Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees did not receive payment of all wages, including overtime and minimum wages and meal and rest period premiums, within any time permissible

MORGAN & MORGAN

under California Labor Code section 204.

43. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but they did not receive complete and accurate wage statements from Defendants. The deficiencies included, *inter alia*, the failure to include the total number of hours worked by Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees.

44. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Defendants had to keep complete and accurate payroll records for Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees in accordance with California law, but they did not keep complete and accurate payroll records.

45. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses.

46. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so and falsely represented to Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees that they were properly denied wages, all in order to increase Defendants' profits.

47. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked. Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work more than eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week without overtime compensation for all overtime hours worked.

48. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to provide all requisite uninterrupted meal and rest periods to Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees.

MORGAN & MORGAN

49. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

50. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation.

51. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees all wages within any time permissible under California law, including, *inter alia*, California Labor Code section 204.

52. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to provide complete or accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees.

53. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to keep complete or accurate payroll records for Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees.

54. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business-related expenses and costs.

55. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to properly compensate Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees pursuant to California law in order to increase Defendants' profits.

56. California Labor Code section 218 states that nothing in Article 1 of the Labor Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to "sue directly . . . for any wages or penalty due to him [or her] under this article."

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198)

(Against MB LUM, LLC and DOES 1 through 100)

57. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

58. California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order

MORGAN & MORGAN

provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either one-and-one-half times (1.5x) or two times (2x) that person's regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

59. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and were required to pay Plaintiff and the Class Members who worked more than eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a workweek at the rate of one-and-one-half times (1.5x) all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a workweek.

60. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants are and were required to pay Plaintiff and the Class Members overtime compensation at a rate of two times (2x) their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day.

61. 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 or forty (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work, and to overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day of work.

62. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the Class Members worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day and/or forty (40) hours in a week.

63. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay overtime wages owed to and the Class Members.

64. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the Class Members the unpaid balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.

65. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

MORGAN & MORGAN

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a))

(Against MB LUM, LLC and DOES 1 through 100)

66. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

67. At all relevant times, the IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiff's and the Class Members' employment by Defendants.

68. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by the applicable IWC Wage Order.

69. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee.

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

71. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the Class Members who were scheduled to work no longer than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for more than five (5) hours without an

MORGAN & MORGAN

uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

72. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the Class Members who were scheduled to work in excess of six (6) hours, were required to work more than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

73. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully required Plaintiff and the Class Members to work during meal periods and failed to compensate them the full meal period premium for work performed during meal periods.

74. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class Members the full meal period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.

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

76. Pursuant to applicable IWC Wage Order 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 the employees' regular rate of compensation for each work day that a meal or rest period is not provided.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7)

(Against MB LUM, LLC and DOES 1 through 100)

77. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

78. At all times herein set forth, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiff's and the Class Members' employment by Defendants.

79. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by the applicable IWC Wage Order.

80. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that "[e]very

MORGAN & MORGAN

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 (3 ½) hours.

81. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Class Members to work four (4) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a ten (10) minute net rest period per each four (4) hour period worked.

82. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully required Plaintiff and the Class Members to work during rest periods and failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class Members the full rest period premium for work performed during rest periods.

83. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class Members the full rest period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.

84. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7.

85. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders 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 the employees' regular hourly rate of compensation for each work day that a rest period was not provided.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1)

(Against MB LUM, LLC and DOES 1 through 100)

86. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

87. At all relevant times, California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 provide that employees must be paid at least minimum wage, and any lesser payment than the fixed minimum is unlawful.

MORGAN & MORGAN

88. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay minimum wage to Plaintiff and the Class Members as required, pursuant to California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

89. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the Class Members the minimum wage as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Pursuant to those sections, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum wage compensation, as well as interest, costs, attorney's fees, and liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

90. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover a penalty of $100.00 for the initial failure to timely pay each employee minimum wages and $250.00 for each subsequent failure to pay each employee minimum wages.

91. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202)

(Against MB LUM, LLC and DOES 1 through 100)

92. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

93. At all relevant times herein set forth, California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits his or her employment, 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.

MORGAN & MORGAN

94. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class Members who are no longer employed by Defendants their earned and unpaid wages within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

95. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the Class Members their earned and unpaid wages within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ is in violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

96. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then 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 is commenced; however, the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

97. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the statutory penalty wages for each day they were not paid, up to a thirty (30) day maximum pursuant to California Labor Code section 203.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 204)

(Against MB LUM, LLC and DOES 1 through 100)

98. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

99. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the first and fifteenth day, inclusive of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the sixteenth and twenty-sixth day of the month during which the labor was performed.

100. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the sixteenth 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 first and tenth day of the following month.

MORGAN & MORGAN

101. At all times herein set forth, 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.

102. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class Members all wages due to them within any time period permissible under California Labor Code section 204.

103. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover all remedies available for violations of California Labor Code section 204.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a))

(Against MB LUM, LLC and DOES 1 through 100)

104. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

105. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code section 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. The deductions made from payments of wages shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly dated with the month, day, and year, and a copy of the statement or a record of the deductions shall be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of employment or at a central location within the State of California.

MORGAN & MORGAN

106. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class Members with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include but are not limited to: the failure to include the total number of hours worked by Plaintiff and the Class Members.

107. 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.

108. More specifically, Plaintiff and the other class members have been injured by Defendants' intentional and willful 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 and itemized wage statements pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(a).

109. 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 $4,000 per employee.

110. Plaintiff and the other class members are also entitled to injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(h).

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 1174(d))

(Against MB LUM, LLC and DOES 1 through 100)

111. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

112. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174(d), an employer shall keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file

MORGAN & MORGAN

for not less than two years.

113. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid to Plaintiff and the Class Members.

114. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d), Plaintiff and the other class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

115. More specifically, Plaintiff and the other class members have been injured by Defendants' intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d) because they were denied both their legal right and protected interest in having available, accurate, and complete payroll records pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174(d).

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802)

(Against MB LUM, LLC and DOES 1 through 100)

116. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

117. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must reimburse its employee 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 obedience to the directions of the employer.

118. Plaintiff and the Class Members incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants.

119. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Class Members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs.

120. 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 their employment, plus interest accrued from the date on which the employee incurred the necessary

MORGAN & MORGAN

expenditures at the same rate as judgments in civil actions in the State of California.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq*.)

(Against MB LUM, LLC and DOES 1 through 100)

121. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

122. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other class members, to the general public, and Defendants' competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

123. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law and constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

124. A violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq. may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the other class members, to work overtime without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198. Additionally, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the other class members, to work through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Defendants' policies and practices of failing to pay minimum wages violate California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Moreover, Defendants' policies and practices of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other class members violate California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 204. Defendants also violated California Labor Code sections 226(a), 1174(d), 2800, and 2802.

125. As a result of the herein described violations of California law, Defendants unlawfully gained an unfair advantage over other businesses.

MORGAN & MORGAN

126. Plaintiff and the other class members have been personally injured by Defendants' unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not necessarily limited to the loss of money and/or property.

127. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq*., Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences May 11, 2022, an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil procedure section 1021.5 and other applicable laws, and an award of costs.

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2698, et seq.)

(Against MB LUM, LLC and DOES 1 through 100)

128. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

129. PAGA expressly establishes that any provision of the California Labor Code which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees for a violation of the California Labor Code, may be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees.

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

131. Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are "aggrieved employees" as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees of Defendants, and the alleged violations were committed against them.

Failure to Pay Overtime

132. Defendants' failure to pay legally required overtime wages to Plaintiff and the

MORGAN & MORGAN

other aggrieved employees is in violation of the IWC Wage Orders and constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198. Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work before their scheduled shifts, after their scheduled shifts, during off-the-clock meal breaks, and/or during rest breaks without compensation, including responding to work-related communications, assisting patients, running client errands, cleaning, answering phone calls, taking out garbage, and performing other regular tasks and duties. As a result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day and/or forty (40) hours in a week, and Defendants did not pay them all overtime wages owed at one-and-one-half or two times their regular rate of pay, including additional remuneration, for all overtime hours worked.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

133. Defendants' failure to provide legally required meal periods to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the IWC Wage Orders and constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work during meal periods and failed to provide them with compliant meal periods, including meal periods that were short, late, interrupted, or missed altogether, and failed to pay them one (1) additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday on which a compliant meal period was not provided.

Failure to Provide Rest Periods

134. Defendants' failure to provide legally required rest periods to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the IWC Wage Orders and constitutes a violation of California Labor Code section 226.7. Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work during rest periods and failed to authorize and permit compliant rest periods, including rest periods that were short, late, interrupted, or missed altogether, and failed to pay them one (1) additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday on which a compliant rest period was not provided.

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

135. Defendants' failure to pay legally required minimum wages to Plaintiff and the

MORGAN & MORGAN

other aggrieved employees is in violation of the IWC Wage Orders and constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1. Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the minimum wages to which they were entitled for work performed off the clock, including work performed before and after their scheduled shifts and during meal periods and rest periods, as alleged above.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination

136. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees upon termination in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 and 202 constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and 202. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees whose employment has ended all wages due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202, including earned and unpaid minimum wages, overtime wages, and meal and rest period premium wages.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

137. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees during employment in accordance with Labor Code section 204 constitutes a violation of California Labor Code section 204. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204, including earned and unpaid minimum wages, overtime wages, and meal and rest period premium wages.

Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements

138. Defendants' failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with Labor Code section 226(a) constitutes a violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The wage statements Defendants provided to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not comply with California Labor Code section 226(a) because, among other deficiencies, they failed to include the total hours worked by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, including time spent working off the clock and during meal periods and rest periods, as alleged above.

Failure to Keep Complete and Accurate Payroll Records

MORGAN & MORGAN

139. Defendants' failure to keep complete and accurate payroll records relating to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with California Labor Code section 1174(d) constitutes a violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d). Defendants failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the actual hours worked daily and the wages earned by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, including earned and unpaid minimum wages, overtime wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, as alleged above.

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business-Related Expenses and Costs

140. Defendants' failure to reimburse Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees for necessary business-related expenses and costs in accordance with California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802. The necessary business-related expenses and costs that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred and that Defendants did not fully reimburse include, but are not limited to, the use of personal phones for business-related purposes, the use of personal vehicles for business-related purposes, and the purchase and maintenance of clothing in compliance with Defendants' uniform and dress code policies.

Failure to Provide One Day's Rest in Seven

141. Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with one (1) day's rest in seven (7) constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 551 and 552. Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to regularly and/or consistently work in excess of six (6) days in a workweek, including workweeks in which they were required to work in excess of thirty (30) hours in the week and/or six (6) hours in any one (1) day, without accumulating or being provided the opportunity to take at least one (1) day of rest.

Failure to Pay Reporting Time Pay

142. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees reporting time pay is in violation of the applicable IWC Wage Orders and constitutes a violation of California Labor Code section 1198. On workdays on which Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees reported for work and were furnished less than half of their usual or scheduled day's work,

MORGAN & MORGAN

Defendants failed to pay them for half of the usual or scheduled day's work, in no event less than two (2) hours nor more than four (4) hours, at their regular rate of pay. On workdays on which Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to report for work a second time and were furnished less than two (2) hours of work on the second reporting, Defendants failed to pay them for two (2) hours at their regular rate of pay.

143. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of all aggrieved employees, requests and is entitled to recover from Defendants and each of them business expenses, unpaid and/or untimely wages according to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.5, as well as all statutory penalties against Defendants and each of them, including but not limited to:

a. Penalties under California Labor Code section 2699(f) in the amount of one hundred dollars ($100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period or two hundred dollars ($200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation where there has been a prior finding or determination that Defendants' policies or practices were unlawful or where Defendants' conduct was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive;

b. Penalties under California Code of Regulations Title 8 section 11010, et seq. in the amount of fifty dollars ($50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars ($100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

c. Penalties under California Labor Code section 210 in addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the California Labor Code in the amount of one hundred dollars ($100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars ($200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

d. Civil penalties under California Labor Code section 558 in the amount of fifty dollars ($50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for

MORGAN & MORGAN

which the employee was underpaid for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars ($100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid for each subsequent violation, in each case in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages, which wages are to be paid to the affected employees;

e. Civil penalties under California Labor Code section 1197.1 in the amount of one hundred dollars ($100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid for any initial intentional violation, and two hundred fifty dollars ($250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid for each subsequent violation of the same specific offense; and

f. Any and all additional penalties and sums as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

144. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(m), civil penalties recovered by aggrieved employees shall be distributed as follows: sixty-five percent (65%) to the LWDA for the enforcement of labor laws and education of employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities and thirty-five percent (35%) to the aggrieved employees.

145. Further, Plaintiff is entitled to seek and recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210, 218.5, 2699, and any other applicable statute

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorney General Act, requests a trial by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated and on behalf of the State of California and other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorney General Act, prays for relief and

MORGAN & MORGAN

judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

Class Certification

1. That this action be certified as a class action;

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

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 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members;

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

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

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

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

As to the Second Cause of Action

10. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiff and the other class members;

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

12. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to

MORGAN & MORGAN

proof;

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

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

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

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

As to the Third Cause of Action

17. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members;

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

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

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

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

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

As to the Fourth Cause of Action

23. 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;

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

25. 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;

MORGAN & MORGAN

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

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

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

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

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

30. 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;

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

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

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

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

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

35. 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 other class members;

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

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

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

MORGAN & MORGAN

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

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

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

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

42. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(h); and

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

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

44. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 1174(d) by willfully failing to keep accurate and complete payroll records for Plaintiff and the other class members as required by California Labor Code section 1174(d);

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

46. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174.5; and

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

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

48. 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;

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

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

MORGAN & MORGAN

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

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

As to the Tenth Cause of Action

53. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq*. by failing to provide Plaintiff and the other class members all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to timely pay Plaintiff's and the other class members' wages, failing to provide Plaintiff and other class members with complete and accurate wage statements, failing to keep complete and accurate payroll records, and failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs.

54. 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;

55. 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 violating California Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq*.;

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

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

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

As to the Eleventh Cause of Action

59. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as alleged in the Eleventh Cause of Action, by failing to pay overtime wages, failing to pay minimum wages, failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premiums, failing to authorize and permit rest periods and

MORGAN & MORGAN

pay rest period premiums, failing to timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements, failing to keep requisite payroll records, failing to reimburse necessary business-related expenses and costs, failing to provide one (1) day's rest in seven (7), and failing to pay reporting time pay, as to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees;

60. For civil penalties and wages pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699(a), (f), (k), and 558, plus costs/expenses and attorneys' fees for violation of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802;

61. For the statutory distribution of any civil penalties recovered, with sixty-five percent (65%) payable to the LWDA and thirty-five percent (35%) payable to the Aggrieved Employees, pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(m); and

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

Dated: October 9, 2026

MORGAN & MORGAN CALIFORNIA LLP

By: _____

MICHAEL A. SIGALL
Attorneys for Plaintiff

MORGAN & MORGAN

PROOF OF SERVICE

Kimmisha James v. MB Lum, LLC
Case No.: C26-01600

I am employed in the county of Los Angeles. I am over the age of 18 years old and not a party to within action. My business address is **MORGAN & MORGAN CALIFORNIA LLP,** 633 W. 5th Street, Suite 2200, Los Angeles, CA 90071.

On October 9, 2026, I served the foregoing document(s) described as:

FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES & ENFORCEMENT UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT, CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 2698, ET SEQ.

on all interested in this action by causing the documents to be sent to the persons at the email address listed on the Service List in a PDF file, and the transmission appeared to be successful.

☒ **BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE:** I transmitted a PDF version of this document by electronic mail to the party(s) identified on the attached service list using the e-mail address(es)indicated, from email address ricardo.nova@forthepeople.com. No electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful was received within a reasonable time after the transmission.

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

Executed on October 9, 2026 at Los Angeles, California.

/s/ Ricardo Nova
RICARDO NOVA

SERVICE LIST

Attorneys for Defendant MB LUM, LLC

Theodore H. Dokko
tdokko@sgrlaw.com
Patrick Cain
pcain@sgrlaw.com
Tyree West
twest@sgrlaw.com
SMITH GAMBRELL RUSSELL
444 South Flower Street, Suite 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90071

MORGAN & MORGAN