

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)
Alexander J. Curry, Esq. (SBN 346207)
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
acurry@lelawfirm.com

Assigned for all purposes
Judge William D. Claster
CX-101

Attorneys for Plaintiff LUISA PINEDA,
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

LUISA PINEDA, on behalf of herself and current
and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

CSL BERKSHIRE OPERATING COMPANY,
L.L.C. dba CLEARWATER AT NEWPORT
BEACH; CLEARWATER AT NEWPORT
BEACH OPCO, LLC; CLEARWATER AT
NEWPORT BEACH OWNER, LLC; HSRE-
CLEARWATER I TRS, LLC; and DOES 1 to
100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 30-2026-01596359-CU-OE-CXC

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF LUISA PINEDA'S
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff LUISA PINEDA ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains against
Defendants CSL BERKSHIRE OPERATING COMPANY, L.L.C. dba CLEARWATER AT
NEWPORT BEACH; CLEARWATER AT NEWPORT BEACH OPCO, LLC; CLEARWATER
AT NEWPORT BEACH OWNER, LLC; HSRE- CLEARWATER I TRS, LLC; and DOES 1 to
100, inclusive (collectively "Defendants") as follows:

///

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 1. This is a Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*
3 (“PAGA”) representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California, herself
4 and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-exempt
5 employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated with
6 Defendants’ violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants’ failure to pay wages for all hours
7 worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure to
8 authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant meal periods or pay meal period premium
9 wages; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or pay rest
10 period premium wages; indemnification for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by
11 employees in direct consequence of discharging their duties; statutory penalties for failure to provide
12 accurate wage statements; statutory waiting time penalties in the form of continuation wages for
13 failure to timely pay employees all wages due upon separation of employment. Plaintiff experienced
14 these violations personally, as well as is informed and believes other aggrieved employees did as
15 well. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce
16 Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys’ fees pursuant to Labor Code section
17 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

18 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

19 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
20 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff’s lawsuit seeks
21 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
22 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of thirty-five thousand dollars
23 (\$35,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
24 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
25 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
26 California, including but not limited to Orange County, at 101 Bayview Place, Newport Beach,
27 California 92660.

28 ///

1 **III. PARTIES**

2 3. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
3 Development Agency on behalf of herself and other current and former employees subject to
4 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
5 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work
6 for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
7 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently
8 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by
9 Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Orange from in or around January 16,
10 2024, until on or around March 19, 2026.

11 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant CSL
12 BERKSHIRE OPERATING COMPANY, L.L.C. dba CLEARWATER AT NEWPORT BEACH is
13 authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business in the State of
14 California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-20 are, and at all times relevant hereto were persons
15 acting on behalf of Defendant CSL BERKSHIRE OPERATING COMPANY, L.L.C. dba
16 CLEARWATER AT NEWPORT BEACH in the establishment of, or ratification of, the
17 aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant CSL BERKSHIRE
18 OPERATING COMPANY, L.L.C. dba CLEARWATER AT NEWPORT BEACH operates in
19 Orange County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Orange County, including but
20 not limited to, at 101 Bayview Place, Newport Beach, California 92660,

21 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant
22 CLEARWATER AT NEWPORT BEACH OPCO, LLC is authorized to do business within the State
23 of California and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 21-40
24 are, and at all times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant CLEARWATER
25 AT NEWPORT BEACH OPCO, LLC in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned
26 illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant CLEARWATER AT NEWPORT BEACH
27 OPCO, LLC operates in Orange County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Orange
28 County, including but not limited to, at 101 Bayview Place, Newport Beach, California 92660.

1 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant
2 CLEARWATER AT NEWPORT BEACH OWNER, LLC is authorized to do business within the
3 State of California and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 41-
4 60 are, and at all times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant CLEARWATER
5 AT NEWPORT BEACH OWNER, LLC in the establishment of, or ratification of, the
6 aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant CLEARWATER AT
7 NEWPORT BEACH OWNER, LLC operates in Orange County and employed Plaintiff and
8 aggrieved employees in Orange County, including but not limited to, at 101 Bayview Place,
9 Newport Beach, California 92660.

10 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant HSRE-
11 CLEARWATER I TRS, LLC is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing
12 business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 61-80 are, and at all times relevant
13 hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant HSRE- CLEARWATER I TRS, LLC in the
14 establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies.
15 Defendant HSRE- CLEARWATER I TRS, LLC operates in Orange County and employed Plaintiff
16 and aggrieved employees in Orange County, including but not limited to, at 101 Bayview Place,
17 Newport Beach, California 92660.

18 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 1
19 through 80 are corporations, or are other business entities or organizations of a nature unknown to
20 Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California non-exempt employees, permitted
21 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised control over the wages, hours and working
22 conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

23 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 81
24 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each of the individual defendants is sued
25 individually and in his or her capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner, representative, manager,
26 supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant who violated or caused to be
27 violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor Code and/or any provision of the
28 Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

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

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

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

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

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

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

13. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 2802, and the applicable Wage Orders.

14. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California Labor Code:

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

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

1 Wage Orders.

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

8 (a) Sometimes requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
9 based hourly non-exempt employees to remain on-duty after clocking out for their meal breaks; and

10 (b) Sometimes requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
11 based hourly non-exempt employees to continue working after clocking out for the end of their shift.

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

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

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

28 21. Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 require an employer to compensate employees a

1 higher rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, in excess of forty (40)
2 hours in a workweek, and on any seventh consecutive day of work in a workweek:

3 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40) hours
4 in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in
5 any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-one-half
6 (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve (12) hours
7 in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay
8 for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a
9 workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an
10 employee.

11 Labor Code section 510.

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

15 (a) Sometimes requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
16 based hourly non-exempt employees to remain on-duty after clocking out for their meal breaks; and

17 (b) Sometimes requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
18 based hourly non-exempt employees to continue working after clocking out for the end of their shift.

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

23 24. The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each
24 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
25 employees were under the control of Defendants but were not compensated. To the extent that the
26 foregoing uncompensated time occurred when Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
27 California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday,
28 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendants failed
to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code
sections 510, 1194 and 1198, and the applicable Wage Order.

///

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

6 26. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an
7 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of
8 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the
9 employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 5 at §11;
10 *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ
11 an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee
12 with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh
13 hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period
14 shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. A paid "on duty" meal
15 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved
16 of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

17 27. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
18 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay
19 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
20 sections 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 5 at §11.

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

25 (a) Sometimes requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
26 based hourly non-exempt employees to remain on-duty after clocking out for their meal breaks
27 resulting in a failure to provide uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes for every
28 five hours worked; and

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

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

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

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

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

33. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor Code section 226.7; Wage Order 5 at §12. Under California law, "[e]mployees are entitled to 10 minutes' rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on." *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code section 226.7; Wage Order 5 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each work period. Wage Order 5 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement "“obligates employers to permit –

1 and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*
2 (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all
3 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

4 34. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer must
5 pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday the
6 employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7; Wage
7 Order 5 at § 12.

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

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

15 (b) Sometimes failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
16 California-based hourly non-exempt employees with a third uninterrupted duty-free rest period of
17 no less than ten (10) net minutes on each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former
18 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

19 36. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
20 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
21 hourly non-exempt employees with one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday
22 they did not receive legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor Code section
23 226.7.

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

28 38. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant’s

1 conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendant
2 would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

12 (a) Sometimes requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
13 based hourly non-exempt employees the use of their personal cell phone (including both telephone
14 use and cellular data use) for work-related purposes without reimbursing Plaintiff and other current
15 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees for such use; and

16 (b) Sometimes requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
17 based hourly non-exempt employees to purchase uniform for work-related purposes - without
18 reimbursing Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
19 employees for such use.

20 41. Moreover, Defendants employed policies and procedures which ensured Plaintiff and
21 aggrieved employees would not receive indemnification for their employment related expenses.
22 This practice resulted in Plaintiff and aggrieved employees not receiving such indemnification in
23 compliance with California law.

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

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

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

2 44. **Failure to timely pay earned wages during employment:** In California, wages
3 must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the
4 employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code section 204(a). Wages earned
5 between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 16th and
6 the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any
7 calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. *Id.* Other payroll
8 periods such as those that are weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly, must be paid within seven (7)
9 calendar days following the close of the payroll period in which wages were earned. Labor Code
10 section 204(d).

11 45. As a derivative of Plaintiff's claims above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to
12 timely pay Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
13 employees' earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages
14 and/or rest period premium wages), in violation of Labor Code section 204. Defendants'
15 aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in their failure to pay Plaintiff's and
16 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' their earned
17 wages within the applicable time frames outlined in Labor Code section 204.

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

21 47. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
22 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
23 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
24 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by
25 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful
26 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,
27 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor
28 Code section 1198, the Defendant secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while

1 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

2 48. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
3 Defendant would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
4 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

18 50. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff
19 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
20 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period
21 premium wages) rendered Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based
22 hourly non-exempt employees’ wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section
23 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

24 51. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

25 52. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
26 Defendant would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
27 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

28 ///

53. **Failure to pay employees all wages due at time of termination/resignation:** An employer is required to pay all unpaid wages timely after an employee's employment ends. The wages are due immediately upon termination (Labor Code section 201) or within seventy-two (72) hours of resignation (Labor Code section 202).

54. As a derivative of Plaintiff's allegations above, because Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all their earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period premium wages), Defendants failed to pay those employees timely after each employee's termination and/or resignation, in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

55. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

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

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

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

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

60. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil

1 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7,
2 510, 512, and 1194: During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, preceding
3 Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the following
4 amounts:

5 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, and 2802;
6 one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and
7 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent
8 violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

9 b. For violations of Labor Code section 226(a), alternatively, two hundred fifty
10 dollars (\$250) for each employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each
11 subsequent violation, one thousand dollars (\$1000) for each underpaid employee for each pay period
12 [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 226.3].

13 c. For violations of Labor Code section 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50) for each
14 employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, one
15 hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts
16 established by Labor Code section 558].

17 d. For violations of Labor Code section 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for
18 each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, or any
19 willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee,
20 plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code
21 section 210].

22 e. For violations of Labor Code section 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for
23 each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, or any
24 willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee,
25 plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code
26 section 225.5].

27 61. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g), Plaintiff is entitled to an award of
28 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with her claims for civil penalties.

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.
Alexander J. Curry, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
LUISA PINEDA
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees