

09/03/2026

By: A. Martinez Deputy

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)
Michael L. Huggins, Esq. (SBN 305562)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
jklein@lelawfirm.com
mhuggins@lelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff CITLALLY S. ROSALES,
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees

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

CITLALLY S. ROSALES, on behalf of herself
and current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

WAL-MART ASSOCIATES, INC.; and DOES 1
to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **26CV021544**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF CITLALLY S.
ROSALES' COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff CITLALLY S. ROSALES ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains
against Defendants WAL-MART ASSOCIATES, INC.; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive (collectively
"Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

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

Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to authorize and permit all legally required and legally compliant lactation accommodation breaks and/or failure to pay lactation accommodation premiums . Plaintiff experienced these violations personally, as well as is informed and believes other aggrieved employees did as well. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of thirty-five thousand dollars (\$35,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout California, including but not limited to Sacramento County, at 10655 Folsom Blvd., Rancho Cordova, California 95670.

III. PARTIES

3. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency on behalf of herself and other current and former employees subject to violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Sacramento from in or around February 22, 2024, until on or around May 22, 2026.

4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant WAL-MART

1 ASSOCIATES, INC. is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business
2 in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant hereto
3 were persons acting on behalf of Defendant WAL-MART ASSOCIATES, INC. in the establishment
4 of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant
5 WAL-MART ASSOCIATES, INC. operates in Sacramento County and employed Plaintiff and
6 aggrieved employees in Sacramento County, including but not limited to, at 10655 Folsom Blvd.,
7 Rancho Cordova, California 95670.

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

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

19 7. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100. Plaintiff
20 sues said defendants by said fictitious names, and will amend this complaint when the true names
21 and capacities are ascertained or when such facts pertaining to liability are ascertained, or as
22 permitted by law or by the Court. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously
23 named defendants is in some manner responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this
24 complaint.

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

28 ///

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**
3 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

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

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

7 10. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges
8 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1030, 1031, 1033 and the applicable Wage Orders.

9 11. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California
10 Labor Code:

11 12. **Failure to authorize and permit all legally required and legally compliant**
12 **lactation accommodation breaks and/or failure to pay lactation accommodation premiums:**
13 Defendants often employed non-exempt employees, including the named Plaintiff and all other
14 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees, who desired to
15 express breast milk for the employees' infant children.

16 13. California law requires every employer to provide a reasonable amount of break time
17 to accommodate an employee's desire to express breast milk for the employee's infant child each
18 time the employee needs to express milk. California law also requires that an employer provide an
19 employee with a room or location for the employee to express milk in private which shall:

20 (a) not be a bathroom, shall be in close proximity to the employee's work area, shielded
21 from view and free from intrusion while the employee is expressing milk;

22 (b) shall be safe, clean, and free of hazardous materials as defined in Labor Code section
23 6382;

24 (c) shall contain a surface to place a breast pump and personal items;

25 (d) shall contain a place to sit; and

26 (e) shall have access to electricity or alternative devices, including, but not limited to,
27 extension cords or charging stations, needed to operate an electric or battery-powered breast pump.

28 14. California law also requires the employer provide access to a sink with running water

1 and a refrigerator suitable for storing milk in close proximity to the employee's workspace or other
2 suitable colling device if a refrigerator cannot be provided. If an employer fails to provide reasonable
3 break time or adequate space to express milk, the employer must pay the employee an additional
4 hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday the adequate space or reasonable time
5 is not provided. (Lab. Code §§1033, subd. (a), 226.7, subd. (c).)

6 15. In this case, Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based
7 hourly non-exempt employees of Defendants sought to express breast milk for the employees' infant
8 children; however, Defendants employed policies, practices, and/or procedures or lack of such
9 policies, practices, and/or procedures which resulted in its failure to provide Plaintiff and all other
10 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees with reasonable break
11 time for lactation or a room which complied with the requirements of California law, including but
12 not limited to, the room not being private and shielded from view or free from intrusion while the
13 employee is expressing milk. For example, the room where Plaintiff and all other current and former
14 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees were permitted to express milk (a) had
15 no blinds or other forms of shielding view of the inside of the room; (b) had no locking mechanism
16 on the door(s); and (c) which other employees were permitted to enter the room while Plaintiff and
17 all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees were
18 expressing milk.

19 16. Additionally, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and all other current and former
20 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees an additional hour of pay at their regular
21 rate of compensation for each workday the employees did not receive all legally required and
22 compliant lactation periods, i.e., legally compliant time or space. Defendants employed policies and
23 procedures which ensured that employees did not receive any lactation period premium wages to
24 compensate them for workdays in which they did not receive all legally required and compliant
25 lactation periods.

26 17. The aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures of Defendants resulted in
27 Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
28 not being provided with all legally required and compliant lactation periods and/or not receiving

1 premium wages to compensate them for such instances, all in violation of California law.

2 18. Pursuant to the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order
3 (“Wage Order”), codified at California Code of Regulations, title 8, section 11050, Defendants are
4 employers of Plaintiff within the meaning of Wage Order 7 and applicable Labor Code sections.
5 Therefore, each of these Defendants is jointly and severally liable for the wrongs complained of
6 herein in violation of the Wage Order and the Labor Code.

7 19. Labor Code sections 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee,
8 on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees, to bring a civil action to
9 recover civil penalties against all Defendants pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code
10 section 2699.3.

11 20. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
12 section 2699.3. On June 29, 2026, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and
13 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of
14 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
15 violations alleged.

16 21. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by
17 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code
18 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the
19 parties notice within 60 days of the date of Plaintiff’s PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends
20 to investigate Plaintiff’s claims.

21 22. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
22 penalties for Defendants’ violations of Labor Code sections 1030, 1031,1033: During Plaintiff’s
23 employment and continuing through the present, preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim
24 Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the following amounts:

25 23. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g), Plaintiff is entitled to an award of
26 reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs in connection with her claims for civil penalties.

27 ///

28 ///

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

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

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

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

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

Dated: September 3, 2026

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

By:



Joseph Lavi, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.
Michael L. Huggins, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
CITLALLY S. ROSALES
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees