

Miriam L. Schimmel (State Bar No. 185089)
mschimmel@blackstonepc.com
Joana Fang (State Bar No. 309623)
jfang@blackstonepc.com
Jared C. Osborne (State Bar No. 335968)
josborne@blackstonepc.com
Alexandra Rose (State Bar No. 329407)
arose@blackstonepc.com
Jasmine Y. Kianfard (State Bar No. 349975)
jkianfard@blackstonepc.com
BLACKSTONE LAW, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel: (310) 622-4278 / Fax: (855) 786-6356

Attorneys for Plaintiff MEIKA GAINES
(formerly MEIKA ELLISON), individually,
and on behalf of other similarly situated
employees and aggrieved employees pursuant
to the California Private Attorneys General Act

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

MEIKA GAINES (formerly known as MEIKA
ELLISON), individually, and on behalf of other
similarly situated employees and aggrieved
employees pursuant to the California Private
Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GEOZONING, INC. dba HEALTHSHERPA and
DOES 1 through 25, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CGC-25-625111

**SECOND AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT**

- (1) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 (Minimum Wages)
- (2) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime)
- (3) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Meal Break Violations)
- (4) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226.7 (Rest Break Violations)
- (5) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 204 and 210 (Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment)
- (6) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226(a) (Wage Statement Violations)
- (7) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 (Untimely Final Wages)

ELECTRONICALLY
FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco
07/17/2026
Clerk of the Court
BY: JAMES FORONDA
Deputy Clerk

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- (8) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses)**
- (9) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 925 and Cal. Business & Professions Code § 16600, *et seq.* (Unlawful Non-Compete/Non-Solicitation Agreements)**
- (10) Violation of Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (Unfair and Unlawful Business Practices)**
- (11) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* (California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004)**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff MEIKA GAINES (formerly known as MEIKA ELLISON) (“Plaintiff”), individually,
2 and on behalf of other similarly situated employees and aggrieved employees pursuant to the
3 California Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”), alleges as follows against Defendant
4 GEOZONING, INC. dba HEALTHSHERPA, and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive (collectively,
5 “Defendants”):

6 **INTRODUCTION**

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

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

16 3. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants hired Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved
17 Employees but, among other things, failed to properly pay them all wages owed for all time worked
18 (including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages), failed to pay them all regular
19 rate wages due (including sick leave pay), failed to provide them with all meal periods and rest periods
20 and associated premium wages to which they were entitled, failed to timely pay them all wages,
21 including sick and vacation pay, due during employment and upon termination of their employment,
22 failed to provide them with accurate itemized wage statements, failed to reimburse them for necessary
23 business expenses, and subjected them to and/or presented them with and/or required them to sign
24 agreements that contain unlawful post-employment non-compete/non-solicitation provisions.

25 4. As a result, Defendants violated, *inter alia*, California Labor Code sections 201, 202,
26 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 245-249, 510, 512(a), 925, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
27 2800, and 2802, the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order, and California
28 Business and Professions Code sections 16600, *et seq.* Through this action, Plaintiff seeks to recover

1 all available remedies including but not limited to actual and liquidated damages and attorney's fees
2 and costs.

3 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

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

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

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

19 9. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants
20 maintain offices, have agents, employ individuals, and/or transact business in the State of California,
21 County of San Francisco, including at 548 Brannan Street Suite 310, San Francisco, CA 94107 and
22 worked remotely out of Plaintiff's residence at 1215 19th St., Sacramento, CA, 95811. Many of the
23 acts, events, and violations alleged herein relating to Plaintiff occurred throughout the State of
24 California, including in the County of San Francisco.

25 **THE PARTIES**

26 10. At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff MEIKA GAINES (formerly known as MEIKA
27 ELLISON) was an individual residing in San Francisco County in the State of California.

28 ///

1 11. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant GEOZONING, INC. dba HEALTHSHERPA
2 was and is an employer who does business in California, with locations throughout the State of
3 California, and whose employees are engaged throughout San Francisco County and the State of
4 California, including at 548 Brannan Street Suite 310, San Francisco, CA 94107.

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

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

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

19 15. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff, Class Members, and
20 Aggrieved Employees, to set work rules and conditions governing their employment, and to
21 supervise their daily employment activities.

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

24 17. Defendants directly hired and paid wages to Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved
25 Employees.

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

28 ///

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

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

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

21. Plaintiff worked for Defendants from approximately August 2021 through approximately December 2021 as an Agent Support Representative. Defendants jointly and severally employed Plaintiff based out of their location in San Francisco, CA. Plaintiff performed various duties for Defendants including, among other things, assisting health insurance agents navigate through the platform and reset passwords.

22. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants engaged in a pattern and practice of wage abuse against their hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees. As set forth in more detail below, this pattern and practice of wage abuse involved, *inter alia*, requiring Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to properly pay wages for all hours worked, failing to provide all meal and rest breaks to which they were entitled and failing to pay meal and rest break premiums when due, failing to timely pay wages during employment and upon termination of employment, failing to provide accurate wage statements, failing to reimburse necessary business-related expenses, and failing to adhere to other related protections afforded by the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Order. Plaintiff further alleges that Plaintiff and the other Class Members have been subjected to and/or presented with and/or required to sign agreements that contain one or more post-employment non-compete/non-solicitation clauses that restrain their engagement in a lawful profession, trade or business.

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

Defendants' profits.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

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

25. The proposed **Class** is defined as follows:

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

26. The proposed **Former Employee Sub-Class** is defined as follows:

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

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

28. There is a well-defined community of interest in this litigation and the Class is easily ascertainable. While the exact number and identities of Class Members are currently unknown to Plaintiff, such information can be ascertained through appropriate discovery from records maintained by Defendants and their agents.

29. The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all its members is impracticable.

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

- i. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other Class Members for all hours worked;

- 1 ii. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to pay overtime wages to
2 Plaintiff and the other Class Members for all overtime hours worked;
- 3 iii. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to provide meal periods to
4 Plaintiff and the other Class Members;
- 5 iv. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to provide rest periods to
6 Plaintiff and the other Class Members;
- 7 v. Whether Defendants failed to pay their hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees in
8 the State of California for all hours worked, and for all missed, short, late, and/or
9 interrupted meal periods and rest breaks;
- 10 vi. Whether Defendants failed to pay all regular rate wages due (including sick pay) to
11 Plaintiff and the other Class Members;
- 12 vii. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay wages due to Plaintiff and the other Class
13 Members during their employment;
- 14 viii. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or reduction, in
15 accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;
- 16 ix. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other Class
17 Members within the required time upon their discharge or resignation;
- 18 x. Whether Defendants failed to pay all vested and accrued vacation wages at the time of
19 separation;
- 20 xi. Whether Defendants failed to comply with wage reporting as required by the California
21 Labor Code, including, *inter alia*, section 226;
- 22 xii. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other Class Members for
23 necessary business-related expenses and costs;
- 24 xiii. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- 25 xiv. Whether Defendants entered into, implemented, and enforced non-compete/non-
26 solicitation agreements that are unlawful and void in violation of Cal. Labor Code §§
27 925 and Cal. Business & Professions Code § 16600, *et seq.*;

28 ///

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

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

xvii. Whether Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

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

32. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy since individual litigation of the claims of all Class Members is impracticable. Even if every Class Member could afford individual litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly burdensome on the courts in which individual litigation of numerous cases would proceed. Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent, and/or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense to all parties and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same factual and legal issues. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action presents fewer management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and of the court system, and protects the rights of each Class Member.

33. 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.

PAGA ALLEGATIONS

34. PAGA is and was applicable to Defendants' employment of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

1 35. PAGA provides that any provision of law under the California Labor Code that
2 provides for a civil penalty, including unpaid wages and premium wages, to be assessed and collected
3 by the LWDA for violations of the California Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through
4 a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of themselves and other current or former
5 employees pursuant to procedures outlined in California Labor Code section 2699.3.

6 36. Pursuant to PAGA, civil action may be brought by an “aggrieved employee,” who is
7 any person employed by the alleged violator who suffered the violations alleged.

8 37. Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees are “Aggrieved Employees”
9 as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c).

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

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

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

25 39. On May 7, 2026, Plaintiff provided notice by electronic submission to the LWDA and
26 by certified mail to Defendants regarding the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged
27 to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations, pursuant to
28 California Labor Code section 2699.3. **A true and correct copy of the Employee’s Notice is**

1 **attached hereto as Exhibit A.**

2 40. On July 13, 2026, Plaintiff provided an amended notice by electronic submission to the
3 LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants to update her legal name. **A true and correct copy of the**
4 **amended notice is attached hereto as Exhibit B.**

5 41. Plaintiff did not receive an LWDA Response within sixty-five (65) calendar days of
6 providing the Employee's Notice.

7 42. Therefore, the administrative prerequisites under California Labor Code section
8 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendants, in addition to other remedies for violations of
9 *inter alia*, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 245-249, 510,
10 512(a), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802 have been satisfied.

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

13 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wage**

14 **(Against All Defendants)**

15 43. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

16 44. California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 provide that the minimum wage
17 for employees fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is the minimum wage to be paid to
18 employees, and the payment of a wage less than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. Plaintiff and the
19 other Class Members were frequently suffered or permitted to work "off-the-clock" prior to clocking
20 in or after clocking out for their shifts, such that they were not paid minimum wage for all hours
21 worked.

22 45. Accordingly, Defendants regularly failed to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiff
23 and the other Class Members for all hours they worked in violation of California Labor Code sections
24 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

25 46. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other Class Members
26 were performing such work "off-the-clock" because, among other things, Defendants' management
27 witnessed, authorized, was made aware of, and/or required Plaintiff and Class Members to perform
28 such work.

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

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

8 49. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members all minimum wages
9 owed also caused Defendants to fail to timely pay all wages due during employment within the time
10 periods required by California Labor Code section 204.

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

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

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

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

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

28 ///

1 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 510 AND 1198**

3 **Unpaid Overtime**

4 **(Against All Defendants)**

5 55. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

62. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover their unpaid overtime compensation, and interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

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

Meal Break Violations

(Against All Defendants)

63. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

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

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

66. 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 period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is not more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee.

///

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

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

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

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

23 71. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other Class
24 Members all meal period premiums due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7 and 512 and
25 the applicable IWC Wage Order. Defendants failed to include all required wages and remuneration,
26 including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary
27 performance pay, when calculating regular rates of pay for meal period premiums and/or merely using
28 straight time pay to calculate regular rates of pay for meal period premiums.

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

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

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE § 226.7

Rest Break Violations

(Against All Defendants)

74. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

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

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

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

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

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

///

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

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

82. Defendants had no policy or practice to pay a premium when rest periods were missed, short, late, and/or interrupted, or otherwise failed to comply with California law, and thus Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members the full rest period premium due to them in violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order. Defendants failed to include all required wages and remuneration, including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary performance pay, when calculating regular rates of pay for rest period premiums and/or merely using straight time pay to calculate regular rates of pay for rest period premiums.

83. Pursuant to the 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 their regular rate of compensation for each workday compliant rest period(s) were not provided as well as interest thereon.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 204 AND 210

Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment

(Against All Defendants)

84. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

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

///

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

87. 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.

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

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

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE § 226(a)

Wage Statement Violations

(Against All Defendants)

90. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

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

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

1 226(a).

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

4 94. Specifically, Plaintiff and the other Class Members have been injured by Defendants'
5 intentional violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) because they were denied both their legal
6 right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving accurate, itemized wage statements under
7 California Labor Code section 226(a). In addition, because Defendants failed to provide the accurate
8 number of total hours worked on wage statements, Plaintiff and the other Class Members have been
9 prevented by Defendants from determining if all hours worked were paid and the extent of the
10 underpayment. Plaintiff had to file this lawsuit, and will further have to conduct discovery, reconstruct
11 time records, and perform computations in order to analyze whether in fact Plaintiff and the other
12 Class Members were paid correctly and the extent of the underpayment, thereby causing Plaintiff to
13 incur expenses and lost time. Plaintiff would not have had to engage in these efforts and incur these
14 costs had Defendants provided the accurate number of total hours worked. This has also delayed
15 Plaintiff's ability to demand and recover the underpayment of wages from Defendants.

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

19 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

21 **Untimely Final Wages**

22 **(Against All Defendants)**

23 96. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

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

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

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

99. As a result of the violations set forth in detail above (failure to pay overtime, failure to pay minimum wages, meal break violations, rest break violations, failure to pay vested and accrued vacation wages, and failure to pay wages at the correct regular rate of pay, including sick pay), at the time that Plaintiff and the other Class Members' employment with Defendants ended, Defendants knowingly and willfully failed to pay them all wages owed to them pursuant to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 245-249, including, without limitation, overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period premium wages, rest period premium wages, vested and accrued vacation wages, sick pay, and all wages due to Plaintiff and Class Members as they became due, as required per California Labor Code section 204.

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

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 2800 AND 2802

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses

(Against All Defendants)

101. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

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

1 in direct consequence of the employee's obedience to the directions of the employer.

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

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

10 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE § 925 AND CAL. BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS**

12 **CODE § 16600, *ET SEQ.***

13 **Unlawful Non-Compete/Non-Solicitation Agreements**

14 **(Against All Defendants)**

15 105. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

16 106. California Labor Code section 925(a)(2) prohibits an employer from requiring an
17 employee who primarily resides and works in California, as a condition of employment, to agree to a
18 provision that would "deprive the employee of the substantive protection of California with respect to
19 a controversy arising in California." In direct contravention to California Labor Code section
20 925(a)(2), Defendants require employees who primarily reside and work in California, as a condition
21 of employment, to agree to non-compete/non-solicitation provisions – provisions that would deprive
22 employees of the substantive protection of California with respect to a controversy arising in
23 California. California Labor Code section 925(b) provides that "[a]ny provision of a contract that
24 violates subdivision (a) is voidable by the employee, and if a provision is rendered void at the request
25 of the employee, the matter shall be adjudicated in California and California law shall govern the
26 dispute." Further, California Labor Code section 925(c) provides that "[i]n addition to injunctive relief
27 and any other remedies available, a court may award an employee who is enforcing his or her rights
28 under this section reasonable attorney's fees."

1 107. California Business and Professions Code section 16600 prohibits non-
2 competition/non-solicitation agreements. Specifically, the Code states “[e]xcept as provided in this
3 chapter, every contract by which anyone is restrained from engaging in a lawful profession, trade, or
4 business of any kind is to that extent void.”

5 108. Any contract restraining anyone from engaging in a lawful profession, trade, or
6 business of any kind – a non-compete/non-solicitation contract - therefore is against public policy if
7 the contract does not fall within one of the limited exceptions in California Business and Professions
8 Code section 16600. None of the limited exceptions are applicable here. An agreement that restrains
9 anyone from engaging in a lawful profession, trade, or business of any kind is a non-compete.

10 109. California Business and Professions Code section 16600.5 provides:

- 11 i. Any contract that is void under this chapter is unenforceable regardless of where
12 and when the contract was signed.
- 13 ii. An employer or former employer shall not attempt to enforce a contract that is
14 void under this chapter regardless of whether the contract was signed and the
15 employment was maintained outside of California.
- 16 iii. An employer shall not enter into a contract with an employee or prospective
17 employee that includes a provision that is void under this chapter.
- 18 iv. An employer that enters into a contract that is void under this chapter or
19 attempts to enforce a contract that is void under this chapter commits a civil
20 violation.
- 21 v. (1) An employee, former employee, or prospective employee may bring a
22 private right of action to enforce this chapter for injunctive relief or the recovery
23 of actual damages, or both. (2) In addition to the remedies described in
24 paragraph (1), a prevailing employee, former employee, or prospective
25 employee in an action based on a violation of this chapter shall be entitled to
26 recover reasonable attorney’s fees and costs

27 110. At all times relevant, Plaintiff and the other Class Members have been subjected to
28 and/or presented with and/or required to sign agreements that contain one or more post-employment

1 non-compete/non-solicitation clauses that restrain their engagement in a lawful profession, trade or
2 business.

3 111. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the other Class Members seek any and all remedies
4 including, but not limited to, declaratory and injunctive relief, damages, monetary relief, and recovery
5 of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to including but not limited to those permitted by
6 California Labor Code section 925 and California Business and Professions Code section 16600, *et*
7 *seq.*

8 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

10 **Unfair and Unlawful Business Practices**

11 **(Against All Defendants)**

12 112. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

13 113. Each and every one of Defendants' acts and omissions in violation of the California
14 Labor Code and/or the applicable IWC Wage Order as alleged in this Complaint, including but not
15 limited to Defendants' failure and refusal to pay overtime compensation, Defendants' failure and
16 refusal to pay minimum wages, Defendants' failure and refusal to provide required meal periods and/or
17 pay meal period premiums, Defendants' failure and refusal to provide required rest periods and/or pay
18 the required rest break premiums, Defendants' failure and refusal to timely pay wages at the correct
19 rate during employment, Defendants' failure and refusal to furnish accurate itemized wage statements,
20 Defendants' failure and refusal to reimburse business-related expenses and costs, and Defendants'
21 failure and refusal to timely pay wages upon termination, and Defendants' entering into,
22 implementation of, and enforcement of unlawful non-compete/non-solicitation agreements or
23 provisions constitutes unfair and unlawful business practices under California Business and
24 Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*

25 114. Defendants' violations of California wage and hour laws constitute unfair and unlawful
26 business practices because, among other things, they were done repeatedly over a significant period
27 of time, and in a systematic manner, to the detriment of Plaintiff and the other Class Members.

28 ///

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

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

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

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 2699, *ET SEQ.*

California Private Attorneys General Act

(Against All Defendants)

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

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

120. PAGA expressly provides for a private right of action to recover civil penalties for violations of the California Labor Code as follows: "*Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies,*

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

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

7 122. Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees are “Aggrieved Employees”
8 as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c).

9 123. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, violates numerous sections of the California
10 Labor Code, including, but not limited to, the following:

- 11 a. Violation of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 for failure to pay overtime
12 wages, as set forth more fully above;
- 13 b. Violation of California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 for failure to pay
14 minimum wages, as set forth more fully above;
- 15 c. Violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) for failure to provide
16 legally required meal periods, as set forth more fully above;
- 17 d. Violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) for failure to pay
18 required meal period premiums, as set forth more fully above;
- 19 e. Violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 for failure to provide legally required
20 rest periods, as set forth more fully above;
- 21 f. Violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 for failure to pay required rest period
22 premiums, as set forth more fully above;
- 23 g. Violation of California Labor Code section 204 for failure to timely pay wages to
24 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees during employment, including regular rate wages,
25 as set forth more fully above;
- 26 h. Violation of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, and 245-249 for failure to
27 pay all wages at time of discharge from employment, including vested and accrued
28 vacation wages, as set forth more fully above;

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

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

125. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(i), 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 (35%) to the Aggrieved Employees.

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff, on behalf of all others similarly situated and other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

Class Certification

1. That this action be certified as a class action as to the first ten causes of action;
2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class as to the first ten causes of action;

- 1 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel; and
- 2 4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel the names and most current/last known
- 3 contact information (addresses, e-mails, and telephone numbers) of all Class Members.

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

5 5. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor

6 Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the

7 other Class Members;

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

9 7. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1 for

10 Plaintiff and the other Class Members in the amount as may be established according to proof at trial;

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

12 were due;

13 9. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California

14 Labor Code section 1194(a);

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

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

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

18 12. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor

19 Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by willfully failing to pay all

20 overtime wages due to Plaintiff and the other Class Members;

21 13. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages

22 as may be appropriate;

23 14. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the

24 date such amounts were due;

25 15. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California

26 Labor Code section 1194(a); and

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

28 ///

As to the Third Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

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

As to the Fourth Cause Action

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

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

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

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

and

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

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

28. 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;

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

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

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

31. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the provisions of California Labor Code section 226(a) as to Plaintiff and the other Class Members, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to them;

- 1 32. For actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
2 33. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(e);
3 34. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to
4 California Labor Code section 226(h); and
5 35. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

6 **As to the Seventh Cause of Action**

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

- 11 37. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
12 38. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for Plaintiff
13 and the other Class Members who have left Defendants' employ;
14 39. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date due; and
15 40. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

16 **As to the Eighth Cause of Action**

17 41. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor
18 Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the other Class Members
19 for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California Labor Code sections 2800 and
20 2802;

- 21 42. For actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
22 43. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;
23 44. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and
24 45. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

25 **As to the Ninth Cause of Action**

26 46. For any and all remedies including, but not limited to, declaratory and injunctive relief,
27 damages, monetary relief, and recovery of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to including
28 but not limited to those permitted by California Labor Code section 925 and California Business and

Professions Code section 16600, *et. seq.*;

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

As to the Tenth Cause of Action

48. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the following California Labor Code sections as to Plaintiff and the other Class Members: 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 (by failing to pay minimum wages); 510 and 1198 (by failing to pay overtime wages); 226.7 and 512(a) (by failing to provide meal and rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof); 204 (by failing to timely pay wages during employment); 226(a) (by failing to provide accurate wage statements); 201, 202, and 203 (by failing to pay all wages owed upon termination); and 2800 and 2802 (by failing to reimburse business-related expenses), and California Business and Professions Code section 16600 (unlawful non-compete agreements);

49. 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;

50. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage, and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a result of violation of California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*;

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

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

As to the Eleventh Cause of Action

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

54. For injunctive relief;

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

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

1 Dated: July 17, 2026

2 **BLACKSTONE LAW, APC**

3 By: /s/ Jasmine Y. Kianfard
4 Miriam L. Schimmel, Esq.
5 Joana Fang, Esq.
6 Jared C. Osborne, Esq.
7 Alexandra Rose, Esq.
8 Jasmine Y. Kianfard, Esq.

9 *Attorneys for* Plaintiff MEIKA GAINES
10 (formerly known as MEIKA ELLISON),
11 individually, and on behalf of other similarly
12 situated employees and aggrieved employees
13 pursuant to the California Private Attorneys
14 General Act

1 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

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

3
4 Dated: July 17, 2026

5 **BLACKSTONE LAW, APC**

6
7 By: /s/ Jasmine Y. Kianfard
8 Miriam L. Schimmel, Esq.
9 Joana Fang, Esq.
10 Jared C. Osborne, Esq.
11 Alexandra Rose, Esq.
12 Jasmine Y. Kianfard, Esq.

13 *Attorneys for* Plaintiff MEIKA GAINES
14 (formerly known as MEIKA ELLISON),
15 individually, and on behalf of other similarly
16 situated employees and aggrieved employees
17 pursuant to the California Private Attorneys
18 General Act
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A

May 7, 2026

PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission

California Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)

Sacramento, CA 95814

<https://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html>

RE: *Meika Ellison Gaines v. HealthSherpa, et. al.*

To Whom It May Concern:

This office represents Meika Ellison Gaines (“Claimant”) with respect to their claims under the California Labor Code against HealthSherpa, *et. al.* (including all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers) (collectively referred to herein as “Employers”). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail.

Employers employed Claimant from approximately August 2021 to December 2021 as non-exempt, hourly-paid employee. Claimant worked as a Customer Service Representative and was based out of Employers’ facility located at 548 Brannan Suite 310, San Francisco, CA 94107.

Claimant intends to bring a representative action seeking penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”). Claimant is seeking penalties on behalf of themselves and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Employers in the State of California during the relevant statutory period who suffered the violations alleged (“Aggrieved Employees”). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3 and shall serve as Claimant’s notice of the provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories in support thereof.

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California’s wage and hour laws during Claimant’s employment, including but not limited to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 245-249, including 246(i) and 246.5, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order (“IWC Wage Order”). Employers’ conduct giving rise to the violations detailed below was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive within the meaning of PAGA.

The claims made on behalf of Claimant and Aggrieved Employees are based upon the following facts and theories:

1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Employers engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 and the applicable IWC Wage Order require employers to pay at least the legal minimum wage to their employees. California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order further require employers to pay no less than one and one-half times an employee's regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek, and to pay no less than twice an employee's regular rate of pay of the employee for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a workweek.

Throughout the relevant time, Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock. Employers failed to compensate Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law.

This uncompensated work often resulted in the total number of hours worked by Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees exceeding the daily and/or weekly triggers for overtime wages, yet Employers failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees applicable overtime rate(s) for these hours.

Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Claimant and Aggrieved Employees.

Employers also failed to pay overtime to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration, including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary performance pay.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employers failed to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders;

penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

2. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to provide employees with an opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the fifth hour of work when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512(a). Employers must provide a second meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the tenth hour of work when an employee works more than ten (10) hours in a day. *Id.* For each day that an employer fails to provide compliant meal period(s), the employer must pay the employee a meal penalty equal to one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. *Id.*

During the relevant time period, Employers failed to provide Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant 30-minute meal periods. Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were required by Employers to work more than five (5) hours per day but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5th) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10th) hour of work. Meal breaks, when provided, were oftentimes interrupted and/or cut short.

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded their own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on maximizing profits over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a compliant meal period was not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a) and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

3. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to authorize and permit employees to take an uninterrupted rest period of no less than ten (10) minutes for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof, worked. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7. For each day that an employer fails to authorize and permit a compliant rest period, the employer owes the employee one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7(c).

Employers failed to authorize and permit Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a rest period was not provided to them in compliance with California law. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

California Labor Code section 204 also requires 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. During the relevant time period, Employers willfully and intentionally failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL ACCRUED VACATION WAGES

Labor Code § 227.3 requires employers to pay separating employees all accrued vacation pay. "The right to a paid vacation, when offered in an employer's policy or contract of employment, constitutes deferred wages for services rendered. Case law from this state and others, as well as principles of equity and justice, compel the conclusion that a proportionate right to a paid vacation 'vests' as the labor is rendered. Once vested, the right is protected from forfeiture by section 227.3. On termination of employment, therefore, the statute requires that an employee be paid in wages for a pro rata share of his vacation pay." *Suastez v. Plastic Dress-Up Co.* (1982) 31 Cal.3d 774, 784. Under California law, vacation plans may not have a use-it-or-lose-it forfeiture

policy.

Henry v. Amrol (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1.

During the relevant time period, Employers failed to compensate Claimant and the Aggrieved Employees with all vested vacation time as wages including upon separation in violation of California Labor Code section 227.3.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203; interest; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. VIOLATIONS REGARDING CALIFORNIA SICK LEAVE/SICK PAY LAWS

California Labor Code sections 245 – 249 provide various protections regarding sick leave for California employees, including accrual of sick leave, notice that California employers must provide to their employees regarding sick leave, etc. Among those, California Labor Code section 246(i) requires an employer to provide written notice about available sick leave, and states in relevant part:

“An employer shall provide an employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either the employee's itemized wage statement described in Section 226 or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee's payment of wages.”

California Labor Code section 246.5 further provides requirements for employer provision of paid sick days for various purposes and sets out various rights of California employees regarding use of sick time/sick pay.

California Labor Code section 248.5, including section (e), provides mechanisms by which an employer may be held liable for violations of sick leave laws within the California Labor Code.

Employers failed to provide proper accrued sick leave to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees and failed to provide proper notice about accrued sick leave. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees requested use of accrued sick leave but were improperly denied permission to use accrued sick leave hours and were instead counted as absent without pay if they attempted to use them. Employers' sick leave policies do not comply with the California Labor Code. Therefore, Employers violated California Labor Code sections 245-249, including 246(i) and 246.5, among others.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to the relevant California Labor Code section including section 248.5; all available equitable and injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

California Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish wage statements to its employees setting forth, *inter alia*, (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 only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, and (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer.

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock), the actual gross wages earned (including wages owed for time spent working off the clock and meal and rest period premiums), and the correct rates of pay. Employers' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements was knowing and intentional. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to 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 with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

9. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. The applicable IWC Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with

the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Claimant and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

10. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION

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.

During the relevant time period, upon the termination of employment (including but not limited to when they were temporarily laid off, laid off, discharged, and/or resigned), Employers failed to pay all wages due to their employees within twenty-four (24) hours of termination or even within seventy-two (72) hours for those who resigned. Specifically, as a result of Employers' practices of requiring Claimant and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, failure to properly calculate regular rates, and failure to accurately record all hours actually worked, Employers failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all straight time wage, minimum wages and overtime compensation owed to them upon termination of their employment. Employers also failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for meal period premiums and rest period premiums they were owed, amongst other wages. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

11. CONCLUSION

Claimant hereby provides notice to the LWDA under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq.*, and specifically asks for an investigation, or if the agency does not intend to investigate the alleged violations, a letter confirming the same so that Claimant may allege a cause of action under PAGA against Employers for the violations discussed in this letter.

This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code

section 2699.3. By law, an employee alleging a violation of one of the above referenced sections must notify his or her employer and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) before he or she can invoke the provisions of Sections 2699, *et seq.*, by seeking redress in court. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(1). The LWDA must then notify the employer and the employee within 60 calendar days regarding whether it intends to investigate the alleged violation. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(B). If the LWDA advises it will not investigate, or if no notice is provided within 65 calendar days, the employee may file a lawsuit invoking the provisions under Labor Code § 2699. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A). It is Claimant's intention to file a civil complaint and to bring the appropriate claims under California Labor Code § 2699 on behalf of themselves, the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees should your office not address Employers' alleged violations within this timeframe.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact my office. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

BLACKSTONE LAW

Jasmine Y. Kianfard
Jasmine Y. Kianfard, Esq.

cc: By U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Hieu T. Williams (hwilliams@hkemploymentlaw.com)
Michelle C. Freeman (mfreeman@hkemploymentlaw.com)
Anna G. Barker (abarker@hkemploymentlaw.com)

HIRSCHFELD KRAEMER LLP

456 Montgomery Street, Suite 2200
San Francisco, California 94104
Tel: (415) 834-0443 / Fax: (415) 834-0443

EXHIBIT B

July 13, 2026

PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission

California Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)

Sacramento, CA 95814

<https://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html>

RE: *Meika Gaines (formerly known as Meika Ellison) v. HealthSherpa, et. al.*

To Whom It May Concern:

This office represents Meika Gaines (formerly known as Meika Ellison) (“Claimant”) with respect to their claims under the California Labor Code against HealthSherpa, *et. al.* (including all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers) (collectively referred to herein as “Employers”). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail.

This amended notice is submitted to update Claimant’s legal name to Meika Gaines (formerly known as Meika Ellison).

Employers employed Claimant from approximately August 2021 to December 2021 as non-exempt, hourly-paid employee. Claimant worked as a Customer Service Representative and was based out of Employers’ facility located at 548 Brannan Suite 310, San Francisco, CA 94107.

Claimant intends to bring a representative action seeking penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”). Claimant is seeking penalties on behalf of themselves and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Employers in the State of California during the relevant statutory period who suffered the violations alleged (“Aggrieved Employees”). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3 and shall serve as Claimant’s notice of the provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories in support thereof.

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California’s wage and hour laws during Claimant’s employment, including but not limited to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 245-249, including 246(i) and 246.5, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194,

1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order (“IWC Wage Order”). Employers’ conduct giving rise to the violations detailed below was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive within the meaning of PAGA.

The claims made on behalf of Claimant and Aggrieved Employees are based upon the following facts and theories:

1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Employers engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 and the applicable IWC Wage Order require employers to pay at least the legal minimum wage to their employees. California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order further require employers to pay no less than one and one-half times an employee’s regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek, and to pay no less than twice an employee’s regular rate of pay of the employee for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a workweek.

Throughout the relevant time, Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock. Employers failed to compensate Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law.

This uncompensated work often resulted in the total number of hours worked by Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees exceeding the daily and/or weekly triggers for overtime wages, yet Employers failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees applicable overtime rate(s) for these hours.

Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Claimant and Aggrieved Employees.

Employers also failed to pay overtime to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration, including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary performance pay.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employers failed to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable

IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

2. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to provide employees with an opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the fifth hour of work when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512(a). Employers must provide a second meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the tenth hour of work when an employee works more than ten (10) hours in a day. *Id.* For each day that an employer fails to provide compliant meal period(s), the employer must pay the employee a meal penalty equal to one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. *Id.*

During the relevant time period, Employers failed to provide Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant 30-minute meal periods. Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were required by Employers to work more than five (5) hours per day but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5th) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10th) hour of work. Meal breaks, when provided, were oftentimes interrupted and/or cut short.

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded their own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on maximizing profits over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal

periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a compliant meal period was not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a) and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

3. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to authorize and permit employees to take an uninterrupted rest period of no less than ten (10) minutes for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof, worked. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7. For each day that an employer fails to authorize and permit a compliant rest period, the employer owes the employee one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7(c).

Employers failed to authorize and permit Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6)

Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a rest period was not provided to them in compliance with California law. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

California Labor Code section 204 also requires 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. During the relevant time period, Employers willfully and intentionally failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL ACCRUED VACATION WAGES

Labor Code § 227.3 requires employers to pay separating employees all accrued vacation pay. "The right to a paid vacation, when offered in an employer's policy or contract of employment, constitutes deferred wages for services rendered. Case law from this state and others, as well as principles of equity and justice, compel the conclusion that a proportionate right to a paid vacation 'vests' as the labor is rendered. Once vested, the right is protected from forfeiture by section 227.3. On termination of employment, therefore, the statute requires that an employee be

paid in wages for a pro rata share of his vacation pay.” *Suastez v. Plastic Dress-Up Co.* (1982) 31 Cal.3d 774, 784. Under California law, vacation plans may not have a use-it-or-lose-it forfeiture policy.

Henry v. Amrol (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1.

During the relevant time period, Employers failed to compensate Claimant and the Aggrieved Employees with all vested vacation time as wages including upon separation in violation of California Labor Code section 227.3.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203; interest; injunctive relief; and attorneys’ fees and costs.

6. VIOLATIONS REGARDING CALIFORNIA SICK LEAVE/SICK PAY LAWS

California Labor Code sections 245 – 249 provide various protections regarding sick leave for California employees, including accrual of sick leave, notice that California employers must provide to their employees regarding sick leave, etc. Among those, California Labor Code section 246(i) requires an employer to provide written notice about available sick leave, and states in relevant part:

“An employer shall provide an employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either the employee’s itemized wage statement described in Section 226 or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee’s payment of wages.”

California Labor Code section 246.5 further provides requirements for employer provision of paid sick days for various purposes and sets out various rights of California employees regarding use of sick time/sick pay.

California Labor Code section 248.5, including section (e), provides mechanisms by which an employer may be held liable for violations of sick leave laws within the California Labor Code.

Employers failed to provide proper accrued sick leave to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees and failed to provide proper notice about accrued sick leave. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees requested use of accrued sick leave but were improperly denied permission to use accrued sick leave hours and were instead counted as absent without pay if they attempted to use them. Employers’ sick leave policies do not comply with the California Labor Code. Therefore, Employers violated California Labor Code sections 245-249, including 246(i) and 246.5, among others.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to the relevant California Labor Code section including section 248.5; all available equitable and injunctive relief; and attorneys’ fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

California Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish wage statements to its employees setting forth, *inter alia*, (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 only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, and (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer.

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock), the actual gross wages earned (including wages owed for time spent working off the clock and meal and rest period premiums), and the correct rates of pay. Employers' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements was knowing and intentional. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to 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 with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

9. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the

discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. The applicable IWC Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Claimant and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

10. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION

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.

During the relevant time period, upon the termination of employment (including but not limited to when they were temporarily laid off, laid off, discharged, and/or resigned), Employers failed to pay all wages due to their employees within twenty-four (24) hours of termination or even within seventy-two (72) hours for those who resigned. Specifically, as a result of Employers' practices of requiring Claimant and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, failure to properly calculate regular rates, and failure to accurately record all hours actually worked, Employers failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all straight time wage, minimum wages and overtime compensation owed to them upon termination of their employment. Employers also failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for meal period premiums and rest period premiums they were owed, amongst other wages. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.


11. CONCLUSION

Claimant hereby provides notice to the LWDA under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq.*, and specifically asks for an investigation, or if the agency does not intend to investigate the alleged violations, a letter confirming the same so that Claimant may allege a cause of action under PAGA against Employers for the violations discussed in this letter.

This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3. By law, an employee alleging a violation of one of the above referenced sections must notify his or her employer and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) before he or she can invoke the provisions of Sections 2699, *et seq.*, by seeking redress in court. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(1). The LWDA must then notify the employer and the employee within 60 calendar days regarding whether it intends to investigate the alleged violation. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(B). If the LWDA advises it will not investigate, or if no notice is provided within 65 calendar days, the employee may file a lawsuit invoking the provisions under Labor Code § 2699. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A). It is Claimant's intention to file a civil complaint and to bring the appropriate claims under California Labor Code § 2699 on behalf of themselves, the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees should your office not address Employers' alleged violations within this timeframe.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact my office. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

BLACKSTONE LAW



Jasmine Y. Kianfard, Esq.

cc: By U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Hieu T. Williams (hwilliams@hkemploymentlaw.com)

Michelle C. Freeman (mfreeman@hkemploymentlaw.com)

Anna G. Barker (abarker@hkemploymentlaw.com)

HIRSCHFELD KRAEMER LLP

456 Montgomery Street, Suite 2200

San Francisco, California 94104

Tel: (415) 834-0443 / Fax: (415) 834-0443

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

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

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

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

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

8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

23
24
25
26
27
28

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

25
26
27
28

6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
86

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

23
24
25
26
27
28

26

27

28

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

/s/ Ana Turcios
Ana Turcios