ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego
10/15/2026 2:04:39 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By E. Schilawski ,Deputy Clerk

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.
Sarah H. Cohen (SBN 330700)
sarah@tomorrowlaw.com
1460 Westwood Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90024
Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

Attorneys for Plaintiff GUSTAVO ESPINOZA HERNANDEZ, as an Aggrieved Employee, and on behalf of all other Aggrieved Employees

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

GUSTAVO ESPINOZA HERNANDEZ, as an Aggrieved Employee, and on behalf of all other Aggrieved Employees under the Labor Code Private Attorneys' General Act of 2004,

Plaintiff

v.

HFF SAN T1 LLC, a California limited liability company; HFF-BRH SFO, LLC, a California limited liability company; HFF-HPH DFW, LLC, a Texas limited liability company; HFF OAK VENTURE LLC, a California limited liability company; HIGH FLYING FOODS SMF HOLDINGS, LLC, a California limited liability company; HIGH FLYING FOODS DEN II LLC, a Colorado limited liability company; HIGH FLYING FOODS SAN DIEGO II LLC, a California limited lability company; HIGH FLYING FOODS SMF, LLC, a California limited liability company; HIGH FLYING FOODS SAN DIEGO, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company; HIGH FLYING FOODS OAK, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company; HIGH FLYING FOODS, a California corporation; HIGH FLYING FOODS DEN, LLC, a California limited liability company; HIGH FLYING FOODS ORD, LLC, a California limited liability company;; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 26CU055219C

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

COMPLAINT UNDER THE LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS' GENERAL ACT OF 2004 FOR CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER LABOR CODE SECTIONS 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1 and 2699

[Amount in Controversy Greater Than $35,000.00]

Plaintiff GUSTAVO ESPINOZA HERNANDEZ ("Plaintiff"), as an Aggrieved Employee, and on behalf of all other Aggrieved Employees under the Labor Code Private Attorneys' General Act of 2004, alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This is a representative action, pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA"), against HFF SAN T1 LLC, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("HFF SAN T1"); HFF-BRH SFO, LLC, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("HFF-BRH SFO"); HFF-HPH DFW, LLC, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("HFF-HPH DFW"); HFF OAK VENTURE LLC, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("HFF OAK VENTURE"); HIGH FLYING FOODS SMF HOLDINGS, LLC, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("HIGH FLYING FOODS SMF HOLDINGS"); HIGH FLYING FOODS DEN II LLC, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("HIGH FLYING FOODS DEN II"); HIGH FLYING FOODS SAN DIEGO II LLC, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("HIGH FLYING FOODS SAN DIEGO II"); HIGH FLYING FOODS SMF, LLC, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("HIGH FLYING FOODS SMF"); HIGH FLYING FOODS SAN DIEGO, LLC, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("HIGH FLYING FOODS SAN DIEGO"); HIGH FLYING FOODS OAK, LLC, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("HIGH FLYING FOODS OAK"); HIGH FLYING FOODS, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("HIGH FLYING FOODS"); HIGH FLYING FOODS DEN, LLC, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("HIGH FLYING FOODS DEN"); HIGH FLYING FOODS ORD, LLC, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("HIGH FLYING FOODS ORD"), (hereinafter, HFF SAN T1, HFF-BRH SFO, HFF-HPH DFW, HFF OAK

VENTURE, HIGH FLYING FOODS SMF HOLDINGS, HIGH FLYING FOODS DEN II, HIGH FLING FOODS SAN DIEGO II, HIGH FLYING FOODS SMF, HIGH FLYING FOODS SAN DIEGO, HIGH FLYING FOODS OAK, HIGH FLYING FOODS, HIGH FLYING FOODS DEN, and HIGH FLYING FOODS ORD collectively, with DOES 1 through 100, as further defined below, "Defendants") as a proxy of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the State of California ("LWDA"), on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees that worked for Defendants during the PAGA Period. Specifically, in connection with any alleged claims for failure to comply with Labor Code sections 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 227.3, 432, 1198, 1198.5 and applicable Wage Orders, Plaintiff seeks to represent all current and former employees that worked for Defendants during the PAGA Period. On all other claims mentioned herein, Plaintiff seeks to represent only non-exempt current and former employees that worked for Defendants during the PAGA Period. Collectively, these employees are herein referred to as "Aggrieved Employees." The "PAGA Period" refers to one year preceding the date notice was submitted to the LWDA, continuing past the date of notice to the LWDA until judgement is entered.

PARTIES

2. Plaintiff GUSTAVO ESPINOZA HERNANDEZ is a resident of the State of California. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee. Plaintiff worked as a Utility Food Runner with duties that included, but were not limited to, working in a warehouse receiving merchandise from various airport restaurants, unloading pallets, organizing merchandise, picking items and moving them to appropriate stores. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Plaintiff GUSTAVO ESPINOZA HERNANDEZ worked for Defendants from approximately August of 2024 through approximately January of 2026.

3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant HFF SAN T1 is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California. At all relevant times herein, HFF SAN T1 employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees within the State of California.

4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant HFF-BRH SFO is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California. At all relevant times herein, HFF-BRH SFO employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees within the State of California.

5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant HFF-HPH DFW is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Texas and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California. At all relevant times herein, HFF-HPH DFW employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees within the State of California.

6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant HFF OAK VENTURE is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California. At all relevant times herein, HFF OAK VENTURE employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees within the State of California.

7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant HIGH FLYING FOODS SMF HOLDINGS is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California. At all relevant times herein, HIGH FLYING FOODS SMF HOLDINGS employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees within the State of California.

8. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant HIGH FLYING FOODS DEN II is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Colorado and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California. At all relevant times herein, HIGH FLYING FOODS DEN II employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees within the State of California.

9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant HIGH FLYING FOODS SAN DIEGO II is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company

organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California. At all relevant times herein, HIGH FLYING FOODS SAN DIEGO II employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees within the State of California.

10. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant HIGH FLYING FOODS SMF is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California. At all relevant times herein, HIGH FLYING FOODS SMF employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees within the State of California.

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant HIGH FLYING FOODS SAN DIEGO is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California. At all relevant times herein, HIGH FLYING FOODS SAN DIEGO employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees within the State of California.

12. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant HIGH FLYING FOODS OAK is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California. At all relevant times herein, HIGH FLYING FOODS OAK employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees within the State of California.

13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant HIGH FLYING FOODS is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California. At all relevant times herein, HIGH FLYING FOODS employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees within the State of California.

14. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant HIGH FLYING FOODS DEN is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the

County of San Diego, State of California. At all relevant times herein, HIGH FLYING FOODS DEN employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees within the State of California.

15. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant HIGH FLYING FOODS ORD is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California. At all relevant times herein, HIGH FLYING FOODS ORD employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees within the State of California.

16. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the defendants designated herein as DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known.

JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS

17. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each defendant acted in all respects pertinent to this action, as the agent of the other defendant(s), carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally attributable to the other defendants. Whenever, heretofore or hereinafter, reference is made to "Defendants," it shall include HFF SAN T1, HFF-BRH SFO, HFF-HPH DFW, HFF OAK VENTURE, HIGH FLYING FOODS SMF HOLDINGS, HIGH FLYING FOODS DEN II, HIGH FLING FOODS SAN DIEGO II, HIGH FLYING FOODS SMF, HIGH FLYING FOODS SAN DIEGO, HIGH FLYING FOODS OAK, HIGH FLYING FOODS, HIGH FLYING FOODS DEN, and HIGH FLYING FOODS ORD, and any of their parent, subsidiary, or affiliated companies within the State of California, as well as DOES 1 through 100 identified herein.

18. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that all the times mentioned herein, each of the Defendants was the agent, principal, employee, employer, representative, joint venture or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, either actually or

ostensibly, and in doing the things alleged herein acted within the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, and conspiracy.

19. All of the acts and conduct described herein of each and every corporate defendant was duly authorized, ordered, and directed by the respective and collective defendant corporate employers, and the officers and management-level employees of said corporate employers. In addition thereto, said corporate employers participated in the aforementioned acts and conduct of their said employees, agents, and representatives, and each of them; and upon completion of the aforesaid acts and conduct of said corporate employees, agents, and representatives, the defendant corporation respectively and collectively ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded, acquiesced, authorized, and otherwise approved of each and all of the said acts and conduct of the aforementioned corporate employees, agents and representatives.

20. As a result of the aforementioned facts, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are joint employers.

JURISDICTION

21. Jurisdiction exists in the Superior Court of the State of California pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 410.10.

22. Venue is proper in San Diego County, California pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure sections 392, *et seq*. because, among other things, San Diego County is where the causes of action complained of herein arose; the county in which the employment relationship began; the county in which performance of the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff and Defendants was due to be performed; the county in which the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff and Defendants was actually performed; and the county in which Defendants, or some of them, reside. Moreover, the unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees in San Diego County, and Defendants employ Aggrieved Employees in San Diego County.

PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ALLEGATIONS

23. Plaintiff is an "Aggrieved Employee" under PAGA, as Plaintiff was employed by Defendants during the PAGA Period and suffered the Labor Code violations set forth herein.

Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties under PAGA, plus reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, for Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved Employees of Defendants during the PAGA Period.

24. Specifically, Plaintiff seeks to recover PAGA civil penalties through a representative action permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in, among other authorities, *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969. According to the same authorities, class certification of the PAGA allegations described herein is not required.

25. Labor Code section 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g), authorizes Aggrieved Employees such as Plaintiff to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3 on behalf of Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved Employees within the PAGA Period.

26. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, on or around July 31, 2026, Plaintiff provided written notice of Defendants' violation of various provisions of the Labor Code to the LWDA online and by certified mail, with return receipt requested, to Defendants ("PAGA Notice").

27. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a)(2)(A), the LWDA did not provide notice of its intention to investigate Defendants' alleged violations within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the PAGA Notice.

28. To the extent Defendants, or either of them, previously used the notice and cure provision of Labor Code section 2699.3 within the last twelve months, under section 2699.3(d), then Defendants, or those who have availed themselves of the cure provisions validly, are not eligible to cure the violations discussed herein under section 2699.3 or otherwise use the early evaluation conference process pursuant to section 2699.3(f).

29. In the event that Defendants, or either of them, is/are determined to have satisfied sections 2699(g), 2699(h), or otherwise 2699(d)(1), Defendants, or any that is determined to have satisfied sections 2699(g), 2699(h), is also, in the alternative, liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(j), 2699(e)(2), and 2699(f)(2).

30. In the event that Defendants, or either of them, is/are determined to have, prior to this notice or a request for records pursuant to Labor Code section 226, 432, or 1198.5, from Plaintiff and/or Plaintiff's counsel, adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all

provisions identified in this notice, said defendant(s) is/are still liable for civil penalties pursuant to section 2699(g)(1)-(3).

31. In the event that Defendants, or either of them is/are deemed to have adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice within sixty (60) days of receiving this notice, said defendant(s) is/are still liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(h)(1)-(3).

32. In the event, the LWDA and/or a court issued a finding or determination to the Defendants, or either of them, that within five (5) years preceding the date of the PAGA Notice the policies or practices which gave rise to the violations alleged herein were unlawful, Defendants, or any of them, would be subject to heightened penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(f)(2)(B)(i), 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3) and **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h) for remedying violations either prior to or after the serving of the PAGA Notice. Regardless, Plaintiff alleges Defendants' conduct giving rise to the violations as detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. Thus, Defendants, or any of them, are further subject to increased penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii) and lack eligibility for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew, or should have known, that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to receive wages for all time worked, including regular, overtime, and double times wages, and that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not receiving all wages owed for work that was required to be performed.

34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had and have a policy or practice of requiring Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek (in violation of Labor Code sections 551 and 552) without paying them proper overtime wages.

35. Upon information and belief, Defendants failed to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked by Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees at the proper rates of pay.

Defendants also engaged, suffered, or permitted Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to clock out for meal periods and continue working and clock out for rest periods. By way of example, Defendants would often interrupt Plaintiff during his meal periods to provide instructions. In addition, Defendants failed to include all forms of remuneration, including a $500 non-discretionary signing bonus into the regular rate of pay during pay periods where overtime was worked.

36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 223, 510, 551, 552, 1197, 1182.12, and applicable Wage Orders based on its continued failure to pay minimum and overtime wages for all hours worked. Thus, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to actual and liquidated damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2, and 1198. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1197.1, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

37. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants, and each of them, had and have a policy or practice of compelling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period to work every day in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof. By way of example, Defendants regularly denied Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees lawful meal periods by, without limitation, failing to provide meal periods all together; interrupting meal periods; and not providing timely meal periods. By way of example, Defendants would often interrupt Plaintiff during his meal period to provide task instructions. Moreover, whenever Plaintiff and, upon information and belief, Aggrieved Employees missed or had a late meal period they would receive a demerit point from Defendants, in which accumulating ten demerit points resulted in termination. When Defendants required Plaintiff and, upon information and belief, Aggrieved Employees to work through their lunch Defendants would

"comp" or remove a demerit point rather than provide a meal premium. . Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated Labor Code sections 512 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Plaintiff is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made for these non-compliant meal periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant meal periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct that gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such, Defendants are further liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

38. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants maintain policies or practices of compelling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees every day to, including, without limitation, work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without authorizing and permitting Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted, timely, and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the employees are completely relieved of all of their duties. By way of example, Defendants regularly denied Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees lawful rest periods by, without limitation, by interrupting rest periods and instating a written policy requiring Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees clock out for rest periods. Given Plaintiff personally suffered these violations of the rest period laws. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period

under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Plaintiff is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant rest periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such, Defendants are further liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

39. As a result of, among other things, Defendants' herein-described policy or practice of failing to: accurately record time; failing to pay overtime and minimum wages; failing to provide meal periods; failing to provide rest periods; and failing to provide compensation in lieu of meal or rest periods, as described above, and due to independent failures in connection therewith, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants also intentionally failed and continues to fail to furnish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; the name of the employee and only the last four digits of their social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number; all deductions; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee; the legal name and address of the employer, and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a). Specifically, Defendants intentionally failed to furnish employees with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect the hours worked by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees and the rates of pay at which they were or should have been paid (including due to failure to pay at the proper regular rate), thus resulting in a failure to reflect gross and net wages earned and paid at each rate, as well. Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226, and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved

Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Plaintiff and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 226 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. Plaintiff is informed and believes that those penalties under Labor Code section 226 were not paid for these violations of Labor Code section 226. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558, 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Thus, Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

40. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants also willfully or intentionally failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to timely pay compensation to Plaintiff and other terminated or resigned employees, including but not limited to, failing to pay all overtime wages owed, including for failure to pay at overtime the proper rate of pay; all minimum wages; and all premium pay owed; vacation pay and paid time off, as set forth above, among other things. Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202 203, and 1198 each pay period for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and thus Plaintiff and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 203 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. However, Plaintiff is informed and believes that those penalties under Labor Code section 203 were not made for these violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(j). Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such, Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

41. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees their paid

time off and vacation time owed upon separation of employment as wages at their final rate of pay in violation of Labor Code section 227.3 and applicable Wage Orders. As such, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Defendants would be liable for civil penalties for violation of Labor Code section 227.3 under Labor Code section 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Therefore, Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

42. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing to pay Aggrieved Employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants did not and do not pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees all wages owed every day and every workweek in accordance with Labor Code sections 204 and 1198. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated Labor Code section 204 and that Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. As such, Defendants would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Therefore, Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

43. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants have or had a policy or practice of failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with all rights afforded to them under the Healthy Workplace Heathy Families Act of 2014, codified at Labor Code section 245, *et seq.,* including, without limitation, the amount of paid sick leave required

to be provided pursuant to California and local laws. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that the sick pay was not provided at the proper regular of pay as required under California law due to failure to properly calculate the regular rate. Plaintiff is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 221, 223, 233, 234, 245 and 246 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace injury reporting. Plaintiff is thus informed and believes that Defendants violated these Labor Code sections, as well as Labor Code section 1198. As such, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations under these sections and Defendants would be liable for civil penalties for violation of the paid sick leave regulations under Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, as well as equitable, injunctive, or restitutionary relief, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. Plaintiff further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

44. In addition to the above, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants failed and continue to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Defendants also failed to provide these documents to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees upon request May 28, 2026 in violation of these Labor Code sections. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, which in turn would entitle Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5, and 2699. Plaintiff further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

45. Because Defendants refused to provide Plaintiff's complete personnel file on May 28, 2026, Plaintiff is unable to provide specifics regarding the exact documents, and language therein, that Plaintiff was required to sign. Nevertheless, Plaintiff recalls, and thus Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment; any allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage; the regular payday designated by Defendants; the name of the employer, including any "doing business as" names used by the employer; the physical address of the employer's main office and the telephone number of the employer; the name, address and telephone number of the workers' compensation insurance carrier; information regarding paid sick leave; and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Defendants under Labor Code section 2810.5. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' failure to provide such information, including rates of pay that are in effect, has permitted Defendants to pay employees at rates of pay that were not agreed upon and violate minimum wage and overtime wage laws in California. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1198 and 2810.5. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Among other relief, employees may collect from Defendants in connection with these violations' civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

46. Plaintiff, in Plaintiff's representative capacity, seeks civil penalties under Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699 for the herein-described acts, which violate the California Labor Code as described above, including on behalf of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees pursuant to PAGA.

FIRST AND ONLY CAUSE OF ACTION

(Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys' General Act (2004) – Against All Defendants)

47. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 210

48. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 204, requires and required that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month."

49. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a) states and stated that "[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3, 204, 204b, 204.1, 205, 205.5, and 1197.5, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, one hundred dollars ($100) for each failure to pay each employee" and "(2) 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."

50. At all relevant times herein, Defendants have had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees during their employment on a timely basis as per Labor Code section 204 including, without limitation, for the reasons and in a manner set forth in the preceding paragraphs. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 210, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover as civil penalties injunctive relief and monetary civil penalties in the amount of one hundred dollars ($100) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation per employee, and two hundred dollars ($200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation in connection with each payment that was made in violation of Labor Code section 204.

Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 226.3

51. Labor Code section 226.3 states that "[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a)

of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars ($250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars ($1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage deduction statement or fails to keep the records required in subdivision (a) of Section 226."

52. Labor Code section 226.3 further provides that "[t]he civil penalties provided for in this section are in addition to any other penalty provided by law."

53. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total hours worked; net wages earned; the name and address of each employer with whom they have been placed to work; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; the legal name of the employer; and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

54. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.3, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants' violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars ($250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one thousand dollars ($1,000) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

Violation of Labor Code § 558

55. Pursuant to Labor Code section 558, subdivision (a): "Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated . . . any provision regulating hours and days of work in any of the Industrial Welfare Commission" shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows:

(1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars ($50) for each underpaid employee and for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages;

(2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars ($100) for each underpaid

employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages;

(3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee."

56. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants, and each of them, violated, or caused to be violated, the Labor Code sections and Wage Orders regulating wages, hours and days of work described herein, including but not limited to Labor Code sections 201-204, 223, 226.7, 510, 511, 512, 551, 552, 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2802.

57. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations, pursuant to Labor Code section 558, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount fifty dollars ($50) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars ($100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

Violation of Labor Code § 1174.5

58. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (b) has required every person employing labor in California to "[a]llow any member of the commission or the employees of the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement free access to the place of business or employment of the person to secure any information or make any investigation that they are authorized by this chapter to ascertain or make. The commission may inspect or make excerpts, relating to the employment of employees, from the books, reports, contracts, payrolls, documents, or papers of the person."

59. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (c) has required every person employing labor in California to "[k]eep a record showing the names and addresses of all employees employed and the ages of all minors."

60. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d) has required every person employing labor in California to "[k]eep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records

shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units earned."

61. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, "[a]ny person employing labor who willfully fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of [Labor Code] Section 1174 or accurate and complete records required by subdivision (d) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, or to allow any member of the commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to subdivision (b) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars ($500).

62. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants have willfully failed to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records under Labor Code section 1174.

63. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations, pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of five hundred dollars ($500) per violation per pay period per Aggrieved Employee.

Violation of Labor Code § 1197.1

64. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, subdivision (a): "Any employer or other person acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, who pays or causes to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or local law, or by an order of the commission shall be subject to a civil penalty, restitution of wages, liquidated damages payable to the employee, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203 as follows:

(1) For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars ($100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is underpaid. This amount shall be in addition to an amount

sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

(2) For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty dollars ($250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is intentionally committed. This amount shall be in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

(3) Wages, liquidated damages, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203, recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee."

65. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants caused Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees not to be paid minimum wages as a result of Defendants routinely failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked by Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees at the proper rates of pay, as described above.

66. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations, pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of one hundred dollars ($100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred and fifty dollars ($250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 2699

67. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of the Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for a violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an Aggrieved Employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

68. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, violated the Labor Code sections described in the preceding paragraphs.

69. As such, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to injunctive relief, one hundred dollars ($100) for each Aggrieved Employee for each pay period in the PAGA Period, and two hundred dollars ($200) for each Aggrieved Employee for each pay period in the PAGA Period to the extent Defendants' conduct is found to be malicious, fraudulent and/or oppressive.

70. Moreover, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees within the State of California whom Plaintiff seeks to represent are entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with their herein-described claims for civil penalties.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, on behalf of Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

A. An award of civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;

B. An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;

C. For equitable, including, without limitation, injunctive relief;

C. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;

D. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

E. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: October 15, 2026

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

BY: */s/ Sarah H. Cohen*
Sarah H. Cohen
Attorneys for Plaintiff GUSTAVO ESPINOZA HERNANDEZ and on behalf of all other Aggrieved Employees