Electronically Received 10/23/2026 03:38 PM

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
10/23/2026
David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
By: R. Lozano Deputy

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.
Jason W. Rothman (Cal. Bar No. 304961)
jason@tomorrowlaw.com
1460 Westwood Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90024
Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

Attorneys for Plaintiff, DESTENIE GALLARDO and on behalf of all others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DESTENIE GALLARDO, an individual and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

CAMINO NUEVO CHARTER ACADEMY, a California corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 26STCV24068

FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE COMPLAINT FOR:

1. FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES;
2. FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES;
3. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS;
4. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS;
5. WAITING TIME PENALTIES;
6. WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS;
7. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES;
8. FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY;
9. FAILURE TO PRODUCE REQUESTED RECORDS;
10. UNFAIR COMPETITION; and
11. CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS' GENERAL ACT (2004) FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR CODE SECTIONS 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1 AND 2699, *et seq*.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
[Amount in Controversy Exceeds $35,000.00]

Plaintiff DESTENIE GALLARDO, on behalf of Plaintiff and all others similarly situated, alleges as follows:

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Class Action, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382, against Camino Nuevo Charter Academy, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("Camino," collectively, with DOES 1 through 100, as further defined below, "Defendants") on behalf of Plaintiff and all other current and former non-exempt employees in California employed by or formerly employed by Defendants ("Class Members").

2. This is also a representative action, pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA"), against Defendants, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California as a proxy of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the State of California ("LWDA"), on behalf of Plaintiff and 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, 432, 1198, 1198.5, as well as 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

A. Plaintiff

3. Plaintiff DESTENIE GALLARDO 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, with duties that included, but were not limited to,

supervising children, assisting with instruction, supporting students, and helping manage the classroom. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Plaintiff DESTENIE GALLARDO worked for Defendants from approximately July of 2024 through approximately February of 2026.

B. Defendants

4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant Camino 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 Los Angeles, State of California. At all relevant times herein, Camino employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees within the State of California.

5. 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.

6. 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 Camino, and any of their parent, subsidiary, or affiliated companies within the State of California, and DOES 1 through 100 identified herein.

JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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

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

11. Venue is proper in Los Angeles County, California pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure sections 392, et seq. because, among other things, Los Angeles 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 reside. Moreover, the unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and Class Members in Los Angeles County, and because Defendants employ numerous Class Members in Los Angeles County.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

12. Defendants knew or should have known Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive wages for all time worked, including regular, overtime, and double times wages. Plaintiff is

informed and believes, and thereon alleges Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members all wages owed for work required to be performed in violation of California state wage and hour laws.

13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, Defendants maintains a practice and/or policy of failing to track all minutes actually worked by Plaintiff and Class Members and failing to pay Plaintiff and Class Members for all minutes worked at the proper rates of pay. Defendants engaged, suffered, or permitted Plaintiff and Class Members to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring Plaintiff and Class Members to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, such as preparing and cleaning the classroom; and to answer phone calls off the clock. For example, each day Plaintiff had to set up and clean the classrooms before clocking in and prepare the classrooms after clocking out for the following day by sweeping, cleaning up after activities such as painting, throwing away trash, and setting up lesson plans. Additionally, Plaintiff had to answer phone calls off the clock in order to prepare lesson plans and send photos to be printed out.

14. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive full, timely thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal period for days on which they worked more than five (5) hours in a work day and a second thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal period for days on which they worked in excess of ten (10) hours in a work day, yet failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with legally complaint meal periods and failed to provide compensation for such unprovided meal periods as required by California wage and hour laws.

15. By way of example, Defendants regularly denied Plaintiff and Class Members lawful meal periods by, without limitation, interrupting meal periods; failing to provide meal periods all together; not providing timely meal periods; and requiring that employees carry cellular telephones during meal periods. For example, Plaintiff had to clock out for meal periods and continue working. Additionally, Plaintiff experienced late meal periods when she had to wait for another teacher or teacher's assistant and experienced interrupted meal periods when she had to discuss lesson plans for the following day.

16. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive a full ten-minute, off-duty, uninterrupted rest period for every four (4) hours worked, or major fraction thereof yet failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and Class Members to take legally complaint rest periods and failed to provide compensation for such unprovided rest periods as required by California wage and hour laws.

17. By way of example, Defendants regularly denied Plaintiff and Class Members lawful rest periods by, without limitation, interrupting rest periods; by failing to provide rest periods all together; requiring employee carry cellular telephones during rest periods; and not providing rest periods in a timely fashion. For example, Plaintiff was told she had to wait to take her rest break or that she would be unable to take it. She was also required to monitor her cell phone during rest breaks.

18. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members who separated from their employment with Defendants during the statutory period were entitled to timely payment of all wages due. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members the full amount of their wages owed to them upon termination and/or resignation as required by Labor Code sections 201 and 202, including for, without limitation, failing to pay overtime wages, minimum wages, and premium wages.

19. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive complete and accurate wage statements and failed to abide by the requirements of Labor Code section 226. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and Class Members with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total hours worked; net wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a). As a result thereof, Defendants failed to furnish employees with an accurate calculation of gross and gross wages earned, as well as gross and net wages paid.

20. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive all wages earned twice during each calendar month, on days designated in advance by

Defendants as the regular paydays. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members the full amount of wages earned in a timely fashion as required under Labor Code section 204.

21. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to be reimbursed for necessary expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, Defendants failed to indemnify Plaintiff and Class Members for the costs incurred for purchasing supplies and using cellular phones for work-related purposes.

22. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to the timely payment of wages upon termination. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members, the full amount of their wages owed to them upon termination and/or resignation as required by Labor Code sections 201 and 202, including for failing to pay overtime wages, minimum wages, and premium wages.

23. Plaintiff, on Plaintiff's own behalf and on behalf of Class Members, brings this action pursuant, but not limited to, Labor Code sections 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 558.1, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 2802, and California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11040, seeking overtime wages, minimum wages, payment of premium wages for missed meal and rest periods, failure to pay timely wages, waiting time penalties, wage statement penalties, failure to indemnify work-related expenses, other such provisions of California law, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

24. Plaintiff, on Plaintiff's own behalf and on behalf of Class Members, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200 through 17208, also seeks (an) injunction(s) prohibiting Defendants from further violating the Labor Code and requiring the establishment of appropriate and effective means to prevent further violations, as well as all monies owed but withheld and retained by Defendants to which Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled, as well as restitution of amounts owed.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

25. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of Plaintiff and Class Members as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382. Plaintiff seeks to represent a class of all current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants within the State of California at any time commencing four (4) years preceding the filing of Plaintiff's complaint up until the time that notice of the class action is provided to the class (collectively referred to as "Class Members").

26. Plaintiff reserves the right under California Rule of Court rule 3.765, subdivision (b) to amend or modify the class description with greater specificity, further divide the defined class into subclasses, and to further specify or limit the issues for which certification is sought.

27. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action under the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure section 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the proposed Class is easily ascertainable.

A. Numerosity

28. The potential Class Members as defined are so numerous that joinder of all the members of the Class is impracticable. While the precise number of Class Members has not been determined yet, Plaintiff is informed and believes that there are over seventy-five (75) Class Members employed by Defendants within the State of California.

29. Accounting for employee turnover during the relevant periods necessarily increases this number. Plaintiff alleges Defendants' employment records would provide information as to the number and location of all Class Members. Joinder of all members of the proposed Class is not practicable.

B. Commonality

30. There are questions of law and fact common to Class Members. These common questions include, but are not limited to:

A. Did Defendants violate Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 by failing to pay all hours worked at a proper overtime rate of pay?

B. Did Defendants violate Labor Code sections 510, 1194 and 1197 by failing to pay for

all other time worked at the employee's regular rate of pay?

C. Did Defendants violate Labor Code section 512 by not authorizing or permitting Class Members to take compliant meal periods?

D. Did Defendants violate Labor Code section 226.7 by not providing Class Members with additional wages for missed or interrupted meal periods?

E. Did Defendants violate applicable Wage Orders by not authorizing or permitting Class Members to take compliant rest periods?

F. Did Defendants violate Labor Code section 226.7 by not providing Class Members with additional wages for missed or interrupted rest periods?

G. Did Defendants violate Labor Code sections 201 and 202 by failing to pay Class Members upon termination or resignation all wages earned?

H. Are Defendants liable to Class Members for waiting time penalties under Labor Code section 203?

I. Did Defendants violate Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by not furnishing Class Members with accurate wage statements?

J. Did Defendants fail to pay Class Members in a timely fashion as required under Labor Code section 204?

K. Did Defendants fail to indemnify Class Members for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or by obedience to the directions of Defendants as required under Labor Code section 2802?

L. Did Defendants violate the Unfair Competition Law, Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*, by their unlawful practices as alleged herein?

M. Are Class Members entitled to restitution of wages under Business and Professions Code section 17203?

N. Are Class Members entitled to costs and attorneys' fees?

O. Are Class Members entitled to interest?

C. Typicality

31. The claims of Plaintiff herein alleged are typical of those claims which could be alleged by any Class Members, and the relief sought is typical of the relief which would be sought by each Class Member in separate actions. Plaintiff and Class Members sustained injuries and damages arising out of and caused by Defendants' common course of conduct in violation of laws and regulations that have the force and effect of law and statutes as alleged herein.

D. Adequacy of Representation

32. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interest of Class Members. Counsel who represents Plaintiff is competent and experienced in litigating wage and hour class actions.

E. Superiority of Class Action

33. A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all Class Members is not practicable, and questions of law and fact common to Class Members predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class Members. Class Members, as further described therein, have been damaged and are entitled to recovery by reason of Defendants' policies and/or practices that have resulted in the violation of the Labor Code, as set out herein.

34. Class action treatment will allow Class Members to litigate their claims in a manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system. Plaintiff is unaware of any difficulties that are likely to be encountered in the management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Pay Overtime Wages – Against All Defendants)

35. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

36. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code sections 510, 1194 and 1199, as well as applicable

Wage Orders.

37. At all times relevant to this complaint, Labor Code section 510 was in effect and provided: "(a) Eight hours of labor constitutes a day's work. Any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of forty hours in any one workweek . . . shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee."

At all times relevant to this complaint, Labor Code section 510 further provided that "[a]ny work in excess of 12 hours in one 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 hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay."

38. Four (4) years prior to the filing of the complaint in this action through the present, Plaintiff and Class Members worked for Defendants during shifts that consisted of more than eight (8) hours in a workday and/or more than forty hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) consecutive workdays in a workweek, without being paid overtime wages for all hours worked as a result of, including but not limited to, Defendants requiring Plaintiff and Class Members to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, such as preparing and cleaning the classroom; and to answer phone calls off the clock. For example, each day Plaintiff had to set up and clean the classrooms before clocking in and prepare the classrooms after clocking out for the following day by sweeping, cleaning up after activities such as painting, throwing away trash, and setting up lesson plans. Additionally, Plaintiff had to answer phone calls off the clock in order to prepare lesson plans and send photos to be printed out.

39. Accordingly, by requiring Plaintiff and Class Members to work greater than eight (8) hours per workday, forty (40) hours per workweek, and/or seven (7) straight workdays without properly compensating overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay, Defendants, on occasion, willfully violated the provisions of the Labor Code, among others, sections 510, 1194, and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and California law.

40. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff and Class Members have been deprived of overtime wages in amounts to be determined at trial, and are entitled to recovery, plus

interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees and costs, pursuant to Labor Code section 1194 and 1199, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Pay Minimum Wages – Against All Defendants)

41. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

42. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code sections 1197, 1199 and applicable Wage Orders.

43. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1197 and applicable Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Defendants' control.

44. For four (4) years prior to the filing of the complaint in this action through the present, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff, and upon information and belief, Class Members, for completing pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, such as preparing and cleaning the classroom; and answering phone calls off the clock. For example, each day Plaintiff had to set up and clean the classrooms before clocking in and prepare the classrooms after clocking out for the following day by sweeping, cleaning up after activities such as painting, throwing away trash, and setting up lesson plans. Additionally, Plaintiff had to answer phone calls off the clock in order to prepare lesson plans and send photos to be printed out. to the detriment of Plaintiff and Class Members.

45. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise due.

46. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 218.6, 1194, 1194.2, Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover the full amount of unpaid minimum wages, interest and penalties thereon, liquidated damages, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Provide Meal Periods – Against All Defendants)

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

48. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code section 512 and applicable Wage Orders.

49. Pursuant to Labor Code section 512 and applicable Wage Orders, no employer shall employ an employee for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a timely meal break of not less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of all of his or her duties. Furthermore, no employer shall employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second timely meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of all of his or her duties.

50. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7, if an employer fails to provide an employee with a meal period as provided in the applicable Wage Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided.

51. For four (4) years prior to the filing of the complaint in this action through the present, Plaintiff and Class Members were not provided complete, timely 30-minute, duty-free uninterrupted meal periods every five hours of work without waiving the right to take them, as permitted. Moreover, Defendants failed to provide one (1) additional hour of pay at the Class Member's regular rate of compensation on the occasions that Class Members were not provided compliant meal periods.

52. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and Class Members compliant meal periods as contemplated by Labor Code section 512, among other California authorities, and failing to provide compensation for such unprovided meal periods, as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code section 512 and applicable Wage Orders.

53. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid additional pay owed

for missed, untimely, interrupted, incomplete and/or on-duty meal periods.

54. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover the full amount of their unpaid additional pay for unprovided compliant meal periods, in amounts to be determined at trial, plus interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees, and costs, under Labor Code sections 226 and 226.7, Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Provide Rest Periods – Against All Defendants)

55. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

56. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former employees of Defendants covered by applicable Wage Orders.

57. California law and applicable Wage Orders require that employers "authorize and permit" employees to take ten (10) minute rest periods in about the middle of each four (4) hour work period "or major fraction thereof." Accordingly, employees who work shifts of three and-a-half (3 ½) to six (6) hours must be provided ten (10) minutes of paid rest period, employees who work shifts of more than six (6) and up to ten (10) hours must be provided with twenty (20) minutes of paid rest period, and employees who work shifts of more than ten (10) hours must be provided thirty (30) minutes of paid rest period.

58. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7, if an employer fails to provide an employee with a meal period or rest period as provided in the applicable Wage Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period is not provided.

59. For four (4) years prior to the filing of the complaint in this action through the present, Plaintiff and Class Members were not authorized or permitted to take complete, timely 10-minute, duty-free uninterrupted rest periods every four (4) hours of work or major fraction thereof. Moreover, Defendants failed to provide one (1) additional hour of pay at the Class Member's regular rate of compensation on the occasions that Class Members were not authorized or permitted to take compliant

rest periods.

60. By their failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff and Class Members to take rest periods contemplated by California law, and one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for such unprovided rest periods, as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders.

61. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid additional pay owed for rest periods that they were not authorized or permitted to take.

62. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover the full amount of their unpaid additional pay for unprovided compliant rest periods, in amounts to be determined at trial, plus interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees, and costs, under Labor Code sections 226 and 226.7, Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Pay All Wages Due Upon Termination – Against All Defendants)

63. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

64. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code sections 201, 202 and 203, as well as applicable Wage Orders.

65. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 201 and 202, Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled upon termination to timely payment of all wages earned and unpaid prior to termination. Discharged Class Members were entitled to payment of all wages earned and unpaid prior to discharge immediately upon termination. Class Members who resigned were entitled to payment of all wages earned and unpaid prior to resignation within 72 hours after giving notice of resignation or, if they gave 72 hours previous notice, they were entitled to payment of all wages earned and unpaid at the time of resignation.

66. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that in the three (3) years

before the filing of the complaint in this action through the present, Defendants, due to the failure to provide overtime wages mentioned above, failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members all wages earned prior to resignation or termination in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 or 202.

67. Plaintiff is informed and believes Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members all wages earned prior to termination or resignation in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 and 202 was willful. Defendants had the ability to pay all wages earned by Plaintiff and Class Members at the time of termination in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 and 202, but intentionally adopted policies or practices incompatible with the requirements of Labor Code sections 201 and 202 resulting in the failure to pay all wages earned prior to termination or resignation.

68. Pursuant to Labor Code section 203, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to waiting time penalties from the date their earned and unpaid wages were due, upon termination or resignation, until paid, up to a maximum of thirty (30) days.

69. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered damages in an amount subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid for all wages earned prior to termination or resignation.

70. Pursuant to Labor Code section 203 and 218.6, Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover waiting time penalties, interest, and their costs of suit, as well.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements – Against All Defendants)

71. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

72. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code section 226, as well as applicable Wage Orders.

73. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive, semi-monthly or at the time of each payment of wages, an accurate itemized statement that accurately reflects, among other things, gross wages earned; total hours worked; net

wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; among other things.

74. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that in the one (1) year before the filing of the complaint in this action through the present, Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by adopting policies and practices that resulted in their failure to furnish Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate itemized statements that accurately reflect, among other things, gross wages earned; total hours worked; net wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; among other things.

75. Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate wage statements was knowing, intentional, and willful. Defendants had the ability to provide Plaintiff and the other Class Members with accurate wage statements, but willfully provided wage statements that Defendants knew were not accurate.

76. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered injury. The absence of accurate information on Class Members' wage statements has delayed timely challenge to Defendants' unlawful pay practices; requires discovery and mathematical computations to determine the amount of wages owed; causes difficulty and expense in attempting to reconstruct time and pay records; and led to submission of inaccurate information about wages and amounts deducted from wages to state and federal governmental agencies, among other things.

77. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e), Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover $50 for the initial pay period during the period in which violation of Labor Code section 226 occurred and $100 for each violation of Labor Code section 226 in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate $4,000.00 per employee.

78. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226, subdivision (h), Plaintiff and class members seek an injunction on Defendants for their failure to comply with the requirements set forth in Labor Code Section 226 (a).

79. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 226, subdivisions (e), (g) and (h), Code of Civil

Procedure section 1032, Civil Code section 3287, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover the full amount of penalties due under Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e), reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment – Against All Defendants)

80. Plaintiff realleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs and incorporate each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

81. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code section 204 and applicable Wage Orders.

82. Labor Code section 204 provides 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."

83. Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a) states 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, 204.2, 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."

84. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that in the one (1) year before the filing of the complaint in this action through the present, Defendants employed policies and practices that resulted in not paying Plaintiff and Class Members in accordance with Labor Code section 204.

85. Pursuant to Labor Code section 210, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code section 204, in the amount of one hundred dollars ($100) for each initial violation per Class Member, and two hundred dollars ($200) for each

subsequent violation in connection with each payment that was made in violation of Labor Code section 204 per Class Member, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.

86. Pursuant to Labor Code section 218.6, Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recovery of penalties, interest, and their costs of suit, as well.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Indemnify – Against All Defendants)

87. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

88. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code section 2802 and applicable Wage Orders.

89. Labor Code section 2802, subdivision (a) provides that "an employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties . . ."

90. For three (3) years prior to the filing of the complaint in this action through the present, Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to incur necessary expenditures or losses in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or at the obedience to the directions of Defendants that included, without limitation: purchasing supplies, and using cellular phones for work-related purposes.

91. During that time period, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants failed and refused, and still fail and refuse to reimburse Plaintiff sand Class Members for those losses and/or expenditures.

92. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered damages in an amount subject to proof, to the extent they were not reimbursed for the herein-described losses and/or expenditures.

93. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2802, Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover reimbursement

for their herein-described losses and/or expenditures, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Produce Requested Records – Against All Defendants)

94. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this complaint as though fully set forth hereon.

95. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(b), current and former employees have the right to inspect or receive a copy of their records pertaining to their employment, upon reasonable request to their employer. Under this statute, an employer that receives a request to inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to a current or former employee must comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than twenty-one calendar days from the date of the request.

96. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1198.5(a), every current and former employee, or his or her representative, has the right to inspect and receive a copy of the personnel records that the employer maintains relating to the employee's performance or to any grievance concerning the employee. Under this statute, upon written request from a current or former employee or his or her representative, an employer must make the contents of those personnel records available for inspection or provide a copy of the personnel records to the current or former employee, or his or her representative, not later than thirty calendar days from the date the employer receives the written request, subject to some limited exceptions.

97. Plaintiff sent written requests through Plaintiff's counsel on March 20, 2026, to Defendants for Plaintiff's payroll records, timecards, and personnel records. However, Plaintiff has not received all of the requested records as of the date of this complaint.

98. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that for three (3) years prior to the filing of this action through the present Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5 by failing to produce employment and personnel records upon request.

99. On information and belief, Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff with all of the requested employment records is not an isolated incident but was instead consistent with Defendants' policy and practice that applied to Plaintiff and Class Members.

100. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(f) and 1198.5(k), Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to a penalties of seven hundred fifty dollars ($750) from Defendants and attorneys' fees and cost.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Unfair Competition – Against All Defendants)

101. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

102. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the unlawful conduct of Defendants alleged herein constitutes unfair competition within the meaning of Business and Professions Code section 17200. Due to their unlawful business practices in violation of the Labor Code, Defendants have gained a competitive advantage over other comparable companies doing business in the State of California that comply with their obligations to compensate employees in accordance with the Labor Code.

103. As a result of Defendants' unfair competition as alleged herein, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered injury in fact and lost money or property.

104. Moreover, as a result of Defendants' unfair competition, as alleged herein, the public has suffered injury. Defendants' Labor Code violations provide them with an unfair competitive advantage against other California employers. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17203 and 17204, Plaintiff seeks public injunctive relief for the benefit of the general public that prohibits Defendants from further violating the Labor Code and requiring the establishment of appropriate and effective means to prevent further violations. This relief benefits Plaintiff only incidentally and as a member of the general public. The primary purpose and effect of this prohibition is to prohibit unlawful acts that threaten future injury to the general public by means of Defendants' unlawful competition with other California employers. (*McGill v. CitiBank, N.A.* (2017) 2 Cal.5th 945, 954; *accord* at 957.)

105. As a distinct ground, Plaintiff seeks under Labor Code section 17203 restitution of all wages and other monies owed to them under the Labor Code, including interest thereon, in which

Plaintiff and Class Members had a property interest and which Defendants nevertheless failed to pay them and instead withheld and retained for themselves. Restitution of the money owed to Plaintiff and Class Members is necessary to prevent Defendants from becoming unjustly enriched by their failure to comply with the Labor Code.

106. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to costs of suit under Code of Civil Procedure section 1032 and interest under Civil Code section 3287.

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

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

108. This claim is brought pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA"), against Defendants, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California as a proxy of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the State of California ("LWDA"), on behalf of Plaintiff and 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, 432, 1198, 1198.5, as well as 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.

109. 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.

110. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, on or around July 30, 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").

111. 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.

Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 210

112. 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."

113. 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."

114. 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

115. 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."

116. 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."

117. 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/or the name and address of the legal entity securing the employer's services if the employer is a farm labor contractor; and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

118. 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

119. 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."

120. 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/or days of work as described herein, including but not limited to Labor Code sections 203, 226, 226.7, 1194 and 2802.

121. 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

122. 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."

123. 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."

124. 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."

125. 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).

126. 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.

127. 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

128. 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."

129. 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.

130. 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

131. 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.

132. 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.

133. 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.

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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

135. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all causes of action one (1) through eleven (11) contained herein.

PRAYER

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

A. An order certifying this case as a Class Action;

B. An Order appointing Plaintiff as Class Representative and appointing Plaintiff's counsel as Class counsel;

C. Damages for all wages earned and owed, including minimum and overtime wages, under Labor Code sections 510, 558.1, 1194, 1197 and 1199;

D. Liquidated damages pursuant to Labor Code sections 558.1 and 1194.2;

E. Damages for unpaid premium wages from missed meal and rest periods under, among other Labor Code sections, 512, 558.1 and 226.7;

F. Penalties for inaccurate wage statements under Labor Code sections 226, subdivision (e) and 558.1;

G. Waiting time penalties under Labor Code sections 203 and 558.1;

H. Penalties for failing to produce records under Labor Code § 226(e) and 1198.5;

I. An injunction under Labor Code Section 226(h) for Defendants failure to comply with the requirements set forth under Labor Code Section 226(a);

J. Penalties to timely pay wages under Labor Code section 210;

K. Damages under Labor Code sections 2802 and 558.1;

L. Preliminary and permanent public injunctions under Labor Code section 17200, *et seq*. imposed for the benefit of the public prohibiting Defendants from further violating the California Labor Code and requiring the establishment of appropriate and effective means to prevent future violations, thus permitting proper competition by other California employers;

M. Restitution of wages and benefits due which were acquired by means of any unfair business practice, according to proof;

N. Prejudgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate allowed by law;

O. For attorneys' fees in prosecuting this action;

P. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

///

///

///

///

///

///

Q. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: October 23, 2026

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

BY: */s/ Jason Rothman*
Jason Rothman

Attorneys for Plaintiff DESTENIE GALLARDO
and on behalf of all others similarly situated