

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)
Michael L. Huggins (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

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT
8/20/2026 12:50
By: Andrea Enriquez, DEPUTY

Attorneys for Plaintiff MICHAEL BERTELSEN,
on behalf of himself and current and former aggrieved employees

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

MICHAEL BERTELSEN, on behalf of himself
and current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

IMPERIAL BAG & PAPER CO. LLC; DADE
PAPER & BAG LLC; BRADY INDUSTRIES,
LLC dba BRADYPLUS; IMPERIAL BRADY;
and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: CIVSB2624490

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF MICHAEL
BERTELSEN'S COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff MICHAEL BERTELSEN ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains
against Defendants IMPERIAL BAG & PAPER CO. LLC; DADE PAPER & BAG LLC; BRADY
INDUSTRIES, LLC dba BRADYPLUS; IMPERIAL BRADY; 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, himself

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

16 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

17 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
18 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
19 civil penalties on behalf of himself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
20 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of thirty-five thousand dollars
21 (\$35,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
22 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
23 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
24 California, including but not limited to San Bernardino County, at 1865 Mountain View Avenue,
25 Loma Linda, California 92354.

26 **III. PARTIES**

27 3. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
28 Development Agency on behalf of himself and other current and former employees subject to

1 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
2 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work
3 for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
4 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently
5 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by
6 Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in San Bernardino from in or around
7 September 25, 2025, until on or around May 21, 2026.

8 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant IMPERIAL
9 BAG & PAPER CO. LLC is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing
10 business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-20 are, and at all times relevant
11 hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant IMPERIAL BAG & PAPER CO. LLC in the
12 establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies.
13 Defendant IMPERIAL BAG & PAPER CO. LLC operates in San Bernardino County and employed
14 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in San Bernardino County, including but not limited to, at 1865
15 Mountain View Avenue, Loma Linda, California 92354.

16 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant DADE PAPER
17 & BAG LLC is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business in the
18 State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 21-40 are, and at all times relevant hereto were
19 persons acting on behalf of Defendant DADE PAPER & BAG LLC in the establishment of, or
20 ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant DADE
21 PAPER & BAG LLC operates in San Bernardino County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved
22 employees in San Bernardino County, including but not limited to, at 1865 Mountain View Avenue,
23 Loma Linda, California 92354.

24 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant BRADY
25 INDUSTRIES, LLC dba BRADYPLUS is authorized to do business within the State of California
26 and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 41-60 are, and at all
27 times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant BRADY INDUSTRIES, LLC dba
28 BRADYPLUS in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour

1 practices or policies. Defendant BRADY INDUSTRIES, LLC dba BRADYPLUS operates in San
2 Bernardino County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in San Bernardino County,
3 including but not limited to, at 1865 Mountain View Avenue, Loma Linda, California 92354.

4 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant IMPERIAL
5 BRADY is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business in the State
6 of California and/or that Defendants DOES 61-80 are, and at all times relevant hereto were persons
7 acting on behalf of Defendant IMPERIAL BRADY in the establishment of, or ratification of, the
8 aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant IMPERIAL BRADY
9 operates in San Bernardino County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in San
10 Bernardino County, including but not limited to, at 1865 Mountain View Avenue, Loma Linda,
11 California 92354.

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

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

23 10. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100. Plaintiff
24 sues said defendants by said fictitious names, and will amend this complaint when the true names
25 and capacities are ascertained or when such facts pertaining to liability are ascertained, or as
26 permitted by law or by the Court. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously
27 named defendants is in some manner responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this
28 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, 2100, 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 Wage Orders.

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

1 to:

2 (a) Sometimes requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
3 based hourly non-exempt employees to clock out for meal breaks but continue working while off-
4 the-clock during these meal breaks in order to maintain compliance with Defendant's quota system.

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

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

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

21 21. Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 require an employer to compensate employees a
22 higher rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, in excess of forty (40)
23 hours in a workweek, and on any seventh consecutive day of work in a workweek:

24 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40) hours
25 in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in
26 any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-one-half
27 (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve (12) hours
28 in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay
for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a
workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an
employee.

1 Labor Code section 510.

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

5 (a) Sometimes requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
6 based hourly non-exempt employees to clock out for meal breaks but continue working while off-
7 the-clock during these meal breaks in order to maintain compliance with Defendant's quota system.

8 23. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
9 Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
10 Defendant would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
11 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

25 26. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an
26 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of
27 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the
28 employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 9 at §11;

1 *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ
2 an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee
3 with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh
4 hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period
5 shall be considered an “on duty” meal period and counted as time worked. A paid “on duty” meal
6 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved
7 of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

8 27. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
9 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay
10 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
11 sections 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 9 at §11.

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

16 (a) Sometimes discouraging duty-free 30-minute meal breaks by requiring Plaintiff and
17 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to comply with
18 Defendant’s quota system; and

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

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

28 30. Defendants’ foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff and

1 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not receiving
2 wages to compensate them for workdays during which Defendants did not provide them with meal
3 periods in compliance with California law.

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

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

11 33. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
12 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor Code
13 section 226.7; Wage Order 9 at §12. Under California law, "[e]mployees are entitled to 10 minutes'
14 rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six
15 hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on." *Brinker*
16 *Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code section 226.7;
17 Wage Order 9 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each work period.
18 Wage Order 9 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement "“obligates employers to permit –
19 and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*
20 (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all
21 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

22 34. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer must
23 pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday the
24 employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7; Wage
25 Order 9 at § 12.

26 35. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit all legally required and
27 compliant rest periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
28 non-exempt employees due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not

1 limited to:

2 (a) Sometimes discouraging duty-free 10-minute rest breaks by requiring Plaintiff and
3 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to comply with
4 Defendant's quota system; and

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

9 36. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
10 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
11 hourly non-exempt employees with one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday
12 they did not receive legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor Code section
13 226.7.

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

18 38. 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 39. **Failure to Indemnify for Losses and Expenditures Incurred as Part of**
22 **Employment:** California law requires that every employer must indemnify its employees for all
23 necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in discharge of his or her duties or at the
24 obedience of the directions of the employer. Moreover, an employer is prohibited from passing the
25 ordinary business expenses and losses of the employer onto the employee. (Lab. Code, § 2802.)

26 40. Defendants have violated Labor Code Section 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiff
27 and other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees' necessary
28 expenditures they incurred in the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendants employed

1 policies, practices, and/or procedures included, but not limited to:

2 (a) Sometimes requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
3 based hourly non-exempt employees the use of their personal cell phone (including both telephone
4 use and cellular data use) for work-related purposes including but not limited to requiring Plaintiff
5 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to take
6 pictures while working of any issues they come across and/or of their completed work to send to
7 their supervisors - without reimbursing Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
8 based hourly non-exempt employees for such use.

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

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

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

19 44. **Illegal Discipline and Termination under the Quota:** Defendants' quota system is
20 illegal and unenforceable because it prevents meal and rest breaks, and because it does not allot
21 "productive time" to use of the restroom and performance of necessary safety checks on equipment
22 prior to shifts. However, Defendants still disciplined employees, including Plaintiff for failing to
23 perform under the quota. Upon information and belief Defendants disciplined up to and including
24 terminating other employees for failing to perform under the quota. Plaintiffs and other current and
25 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees are due lost wages, reinstatement
26 and emotional distress damages.

27 45. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the above practices he experienced were not
28 unique to him but rather were companywide policies and practices at all distribution facilities in the

1 State of California and were suffered by all non-exempt employees.

2 46. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the unlawful wage and hour policies described
3 in this action are set centrally and are applicable throughout California. Plaintiff is informed and
4 believes that the unlawful wage and hour policies described in this action are still ongoing.

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

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

21 49. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
22 Defendant would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
23 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

24 50. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
25 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
26 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
27 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by
28 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful

1 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,
2 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor
3 Code section 1198, the Defendant secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while
4 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

5 51. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
6 Defendant would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
7 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

21 53. As a derivative of Plaintiff's allegations above, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff
22 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
23 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period
24 premium wages) rendered Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based
25 hourly non-exempt employees' wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section
26 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

27 54. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

28 55. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.

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

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

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

12 58. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

13 59. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
14 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
15 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

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

1 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

2 63. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
3 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7,
4 510, 512, and 1194: During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, preceding
5 Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the following
6 amounts:

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

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

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

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

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

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF 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: August 20, 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
MICHAEL BERTELSEN
on behalf of himself and current and former
aggrieved employees