

Fawn F. Bekam (SBN 307312)
fawn@abramsonlabor.com
Andrew Sandoval (SBN 346996)
andrew.s@abramsonlabor.com
Refugio Ortega-Carrillo (SBN 346933)
refugio@abramsonlabor.com
ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP
1700 W. Burbank Blvd.
Burbank, CA 91506
Telephone: (213) 493-6300
Facsimile: (213) 336-3704

Attorneys for Plaintiff Maria Toledo, individually, and
on behalf of all other aggrieved employees

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

MARIA TOLEDO, individually, and on behalf
of all other aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

v.

PENTAIR WATER POOL AND SPA, INC.; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2026CUOE069550

**REPRESENTATIVE COMPLAINT FOR
ENFORCEMENT OF THE PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004,
LABOR CODE §§ 2698, ET SEQ.:**

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Ventura

07/09/2026

K. Bieker
Executive Officer and Clerk

By:  Deputy Clerk

Ashley Pekarek

1 Plaintiff Maria Toledo (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all other aggrieved
2 employees, alleges as follows:

3 INTRODUCTION

4 1. Plaintiff brings this representative action against defendants Pentair Water Pool and
5 Spa, Inc. and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive (collectively, “Defendants”), on Plaintiff’s own behalf
6 and on behalf of all other non-exempt employees currently or formerly employed by Defendants
7 in California at any time from May 4, 2025 to the present (“aggrieved employees”).

8 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants have
9 violated state wage and hour laws by, among other things:

- 10 (a) failing to pay all minimum and overtime wages;
- 11 (b) failing to provide meal periods or pay meal period premiums;
- 12 (c) failing to authorize or permit rest periods or pay rest period premiums;
- 13 (d) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
- 14 (e) failing to pay all wages due during employment and upon separation of
15 employment.

16 3. Plaintiff seeks monetary relief against Defendants on behalf of himself and all other
17 aggrieved employees to recover, among other things, attorneys’ fees, costs and expenses, and civil
18 penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174,
19 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2698, *et seq.*

20 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

21 4. The penalties and other legal and equitable relief sought by Plaintiff exceed the
22 minimal jurisdictional limits of this Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

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

27 6. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and
28 belief, Defendants are citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California,

1 and/or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise
2 of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play
3 and substantial justice.

4 7. Venue is proper in this court because Defendants maintain offices, have agents,
5 employ individuals, and/or transact business in this county.

6 **THE PARTIES**

7 8. Plaintiff is a California citizen and was employed by Defendants in Moorpark,
8 California as a non-exempt machine operator from approximately February 2024 to approximately
9 September 2025.

10 9. Defendants were and are subject to the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders as
11 employers whose employees were and are engaged to work throughout this county and the State
12 of California.

13 10. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names or capacities of the Defendant sued herein
14 under the fictitious names DOES 1 through 50 but will amend the complaint and serve such
15 fictitiously named Defendants once their names and capacities become known.

16 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each and all of the acts
17 and omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable, to each Defendant acting as
18 the agent, employee, alter ego, and/or joint venturer of, or working in concert with, each of the
19 other co-Defendants and within the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture,
20 or concerted activity with legal authority to act on the others' behalf.

21 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that during the relevant time
22 period, DOES 1 through 50 were the employers of Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees
23 within the meaning of all applicable state laws and statutes. Plaintiff is informed and believes and
24 thereon alleges that DOES 1 through 50 directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working
25 conditions, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff and the other aggrieved
26 employees so as to make each Defendant an employer liable under the statutory provision set forth
27 herein.

28 ///

13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that DOES 1 through 50 had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees' employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

14. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that DOES 1 through 50 exercise sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's and the other aggrieved employees' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

15. During the relevant time period, Defendants employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees as non-exempt employees throughout California at Defendants' California business location(s).

16. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were entitled to compensation for all hours worked. However, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and aggrieved employees all wages due for all hours worked due to Defendants' policy and practice of paying overtime wages for all hours worked in a shift rather than for all hours worked in a workday. As a result, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for all minimum and regular wages in violation of the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order.

17. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were entitled to receive 30-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for every 5 hours worked or payment of meal period premiums at their regular rate of pay in lieu thereof. However, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and aggrieved employees with 30-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for every 5 hours worked and failed to pay meal period premiums at their regular rate of pay in lieu thereof in violation of the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order.

18. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were entitled to receive 10-minute, duty-free rest periods for every 4 hours worked or major fraction thereof or payment of rest period premiums at their regular rate of pay in lieu

1 thereof. However, Defendants failed to permit Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to take 10-
2 minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods for every 4 hours worked or major fraction thereof
3 and failed to pay rest period premiums at their regular rate of pay in lieu thereof in violation of the
4 Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order.

5 19. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and aggrieved
6 employees were entitled to reimburse for necessary expenditures. However, Defendants made it
7 necessary for Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to use their personal devices to clock in and out
8 on a mobile application, and Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for
9 these expenses in violation of the Labor Code.

10 20. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and aggrieved
11 employees were entitled to itemized wage statements that accurately showed, *inter alia*, gross
12 wages earned, total hours worked, net wages earned, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during
13 the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

14 21. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and aggrieved
15 employees were entitled to timely payment of wages due during employment and upon separation
16 of employment. In violation of the Labor Code, Plaintiff and aggrieved employees did not receive
17 payment of all wages within the required time periods.

18 22. During the relevant time period, Defendants knew they had a duty to compensate
19 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees, and Defendants had the financial ability to pay such
20 compensation but willfully, knowingly, and/or intentionally failed to do so in order to increase
21 Defendants' profits.

22 23. Therefore, Plaintiff brings this lawsuit against Defendants on Plaintiff's own behalf
23 and on behalf of all aggrieved employees to recover, among other things, attorneys' fees, civil
24 penalties, costs, and expenses.

25 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **ENFORCEMENT OF LABOR CODE §§ 2698, ET SEQ.**

27 (Private Attorneys General Act of 2004)

28 24. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as

1 though fully set forth herein.

2 25. Labor Code § 2699(a) provides that notwithstanding any other provision of law, any
3 provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor
4 and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
5 agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a
6 civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or
7 former employees against whom a violation of the same code provision was committed pursuant
8 to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.

9 26. Labor Code § 2699(m) provides that civil penalties recovered by aggrieved
10 employees shall be distributed as follows: 65% to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency
11 for enforcement of labor laws, including the administration of this part, and for education of
12 employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities under this code, to be continuously
13 appropriated to supplement and not supplant the funding to the agency for those purposes; and
14 35% to the aggrieved employees.

15 27. Plaintiff and all other non-exempt employees currently or formerly employed by
16 Defendants in California at any time from May 4, 2025 to the present are “aggrieved employees”
17 as defined in Labor Code § 2699(c).

18 28. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, violates numerous Labor Code sections,
19 including the following:

- 20 (a) Failing to pay minimum and overtime wages to Plaintiff and other aggrieved
21 employees at the correct rate in violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 558,
22 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198;
- 23 (b) Failing to provide compliant meal periods without paying Plaintiff and other
24 aggrieved employees meal period premiums for each day that lawful meal
25 periods were not provided in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;
- 26 (c) Failing to authorize and permit compliant rest breaks without paying
27 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees rest period premiums for each day
28 that lawful rest periods were not authorized or permitted in violation of

Labor Code § 226.7;

(d) Failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226;

(e) Failing to timely pay all wages due during Plaintiff's and other aggrieved employees' employment and at the end of their employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, and 210; and

(f) Failing to maintain accurate and complete records showing the hours worked each day by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5.

29. Plaintiff personally suffered each of the Labor Code violations alleged in this lawsuit within the one-year period prior to her PAGA notice.

30. Plaintiff has exhausted the administrative requirements provided in Labor Code § 2699.3 as to Defendants and is therefore able to pursue a claim for penalties on Plaintiff's own behalf and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees under PAGA.

31. Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2699, 2699.3, and 2699.5 for the Labor Code violations alleged herein.

32. Plaintiff is entitled to recover attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 218.5, and 2699(k)(1).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

On Plaintiff's own behalf and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. For civil penalties pursuant to PAGA;

2. For injunctive relief;

3. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit and interest, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 218.5, and 2699(k)(1); and

///

///

///

1 4. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

2
3 Dated: July 9, 2026

ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP

4
5 By: 

6 Fawn F. Bekam
7 Andrew Sandoval
8 Refugio Ortega-Carrillo
9 Attorneys for Plaintiff Maria Toledo