

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)
Jovahn M. Wiggins, Esq. (SBN 349903)
Anthony T. Walker, Esq. (SBN 361352)
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
jwiggins@lelawfirm.com
awalker@lelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff RUDI BRENT,
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees

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

RUDI BRENT, on behalf of herself and current
and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

AMPLA HEALTH; and DOES 1 to 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: CVCS26-0002122

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF RUDI BRENT'S
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff RUDI BRENT ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains against
Defendant AMPLA HEALTH; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive (collectively "Defendant") 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 Defendant who worked as hourly non-exempt
employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated with

Defendant's violation of the Labor Code based on Defendant's failure to pay wages for all hours worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant meal periods or pay meal period premium wages; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or pay rest period premium wages; indemnification for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by employees in direct consequence of discharging their duties; statutory penalties for failure to provide accurate wage statements; statutory waiting time penalties in the form of continuation wages for failure to timely pay employees all wages due upon separation of employment. 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); Defendant 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 Sutter County, at 1000 Sutter Street, Yuba City, CA 95991.

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 Defendant who work, worked, or will work for Defendant 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

1 Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by
2 Defendant in an hourly position at Defendant's location in Sutter from in or around February 10,
3 2025, until on or around June 27, 2025.

4 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant AMPLA
5 HEALTH is authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business in the
6 State of California and/or that Defendant DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant hereto were
7 persons acting on behalf of Defendant AMPLA HEALTH in the establishment of, or ratification of,
8 the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant AMPLA HEALTH
9 operates in Sutter County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Sutter County,
10 including but not limited to, at 1000 Sutter Street, Yuba City, CA 95991.

11 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant DOES 1
12 through 50 is a corporation, or is another business entity or organization of a nature unknown to
13 Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California non-exempt employees, permitted
14 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised control over the wages, hours and working
15 conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

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

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

27 8. Plaintiff makes the allegations in this complaint without any admission that, as to
28 any particular allegation, Plaintiff bears the burden of pleading, proving, or persuading and Plaintiff

1 reserves all of Plaintiff's right to plead in the alternative.

2 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

3 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**
4 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

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

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

8 10. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges
9 Defendant violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197,
10 2802, and the applicable Wage Orders.

11 11. Specifically, Defendant has committed the following violations of California Labor
12 Code:

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

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

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

28 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly

non-exempt employees to remain on-duty after clocking- out for their meal breaks.

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

16. 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).

17. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay and/or failure to pay overtime wages at the proper rate of pay:** Defendant 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 that inure to the benefit of the employer.'

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

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

Labor Code section 510.

19. In this case, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees overtime wages for all overtime hours worked due

to Defendant's policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to:

(a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to remain on-duty after clocking- out for their meal breaks.

20. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer'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).

21. The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees were under the control of Defendant but were not compensated. To the extent that the foregoing uncompensated time occurred when Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday, more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendant 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.

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

23. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 4 at §11; *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period

1 shall be considered an “on duty” meal period and counted as time worked. A paid “on duty” meal
2 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved
3 of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

4 24. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
5 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay
6 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
7 sections 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 4 at §11.

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

12 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
13 non-exempt employees to routinely remain on-duty after clocking out for their meal breaks resulting
14 in untimely uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes for every five hours worked.

15 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
16 hourly non-exempt employees with timely, uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30
17 minutes for every five hours worked, due to workload and understaffing.

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

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

27 28. 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

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

29. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that Defendant 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.

30. 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 4 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 4 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each work period. Wage Order 4 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement “obligates employers to permit – and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

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

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

(a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof, due to workload and understaffing.

33. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant maintained a policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based

1 hourly non-exempt employees with one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday
2 they did not receive legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor Code section
3 226.7.

4 34. Defendant's foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff and
5 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not receiving
6 wages to compensate them for workdays in which Defendant did not provide them with rest periods
7 in compliance with California law.

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

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

16 37. Defendant has violated Labor Code Section 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiff
17 and other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees' necessary
18 expenditures they incurred in the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendant employed
19 policies, practices, and/or procedures included, but not limited to:

20 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
21 non-exempt employees to use their personal cell phone (including both telephone use and cellular
22 data use) for work-related purposes - without reimbursing Plaintiff and other current and former
23 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees for such use.

24 38. Moreover, Defendant employed policies and procedures which ensured Plaintiff and
25 aggrieved employees would not receive indemnification for their employment related expenses.
26 This practice resulted in Plaintiff and aggrieved employees not receiving such indemnification in
27 compliance with California law.

28 39. Therefore, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for their

employment related expenses, including but not limited to costs related to use of their personal cell phones and costs associated with their uniforms pursuant to Labor Code section 2802.

40. 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).

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

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

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

44. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by

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

6 45. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
 7 Defendant would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
 8 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

22 47. As a derivative of Plaintiff's allegations above, Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff
 23 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
 24 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period
 25 premium wages) rendered Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based
 26 hourly non-exempt employees' wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section
 27 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

28 48. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

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

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

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

13 52. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional.

14 53. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.
15 Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
16 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

17 54. Labor Code sections 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee,
18 on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees, to bring a civil action to
19 recover civil penalties against Defendant pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section
20 2699.3.

21 55. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
22 section 2699.3. On June 12, 2026, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and
23 provided notice to Defendant by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of
24 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
25 violations alleged.

26 56. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by
27 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code
28 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 section 225.5].

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

4 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

7 **ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:**

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

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

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

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

17
18 Dated: August 17, 2026

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

19
20 By:



Joseph Lavi, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.
Jovahn M. Wiggins, Esq.
Anthony T. Walker, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
RUDI BRENT
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved
employees