

DOUGLAS HAN (SBN 232858)
 SHUNT TATAVOS-GHARAJEH (SBN 272164)
 CHRISTOPHER PETERSEN (SBN 260631)
JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION
 751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101
 Pasadena, California 91103
 Telephone: (818) 230-7502
 Facsimile: (818) 230-7259

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

DALE PAYNE, individually, and on behalf
 of other members of the general public
 similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

v.

AVALON TRANSPORTATION, LLC, a
 California limited liability company;
 VIRGIN FISH, INC., a California
 corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,
 inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: 23STCV30586

**THIRD AMENDED CLASS ACTION
 COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**

- (1) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime);
- (2) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Unpaid Meal Period Premiums);
- (3) Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 (Unpaid Rest Period Premiums);
- (4) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197 (Unpaid Minimum Wages);
- (5) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 (Final Wages Not Timely Paid);
- (6) Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) (Non-Compliant Wage Statements);
- (7) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Unreimbursed Business Expenses);
- (8) Violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*
- (9) Violation of California Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* (Private Attorneys General Act of 2004);

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMES NOW, Plaintiff KAMIL AL-AHDALI (“Plaintiff”), individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, and alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This class action is brought pursuant to the Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all other causes” except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

3. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief, Defendants are citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

4. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles. The majority of the acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiff took place in the State of California. Defendants employed Plaintiff within the State of California.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff KAMIL AL-AHDALI is an individual residing in the State of California.

6. Defendant AVALON TRANSPORTATION, LLC at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, a California limited liability company headquartered in the State of California, and at all times herein mentioned, was and is, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles. Defendant VIRGIN FISH, INC. at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon

information and belief, a California corporation headquartered in the State of California, and at all times herein mentioned, was and is, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles.

7. At all relevant times, Defendants AVALON TRANSPORTATION, LLC and VIRGIN FISH, INC. were each the “employer” of Plaintiff within the meaning of all applicable laws and statutes.

8. At all times herein relevant, Defendants AVALON TRANSPORTATION, LLC, VIRGIN FISH, INC., and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, were the agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and assigns, and all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization, and consent of each defendant designated herein.

9. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual or otherwise, of Defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff, who sues said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based on that information and belief alleges, that each of the Defendants designated as a DOE is legally responsible for the events and happenings referred to in this Complaint, and unlawfully caused the injuries and damages to Plaintiff and the other class members as alleged in this Complaint. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to show the true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

10. Defendants AVALON TRANSPORTATION, LLC, VIRGIN FISH, INC., and DOES 1 through 100 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as “Defendants.”

///

///

///

11. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff and the other class members so as to make each of said Defendants and employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

12. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and, thus, seeks class certification under Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

13. The proposed class is defined as follows:

All current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of Defendants within the State of California at any time from December 14, 2019, through June 7, 2025, excluding exclusively non-chauffeur drivers.

14. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish subclasses as appropriate.

15. The class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation:

a. Numerosity: The class members are so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable. The membership of the entire class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time. However, the class is estimated to be greater than fifty (50) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment records.

b. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of all other class members' claims as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the other class members with whom Plaintiff has a well-defined community of interest.

c. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of each class member, with whom Plaintiff has a well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no interest that is antagonistic to the other class members. Plaintiff's

attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and during the pendency of this action will continue to incur, costs and attorneys' fees, that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder of all class members is impractical.

e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. However, class actions provide the class members who are not named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights.

16. There are common questions of law and fact as to the class members that predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The following common questions of law or fact, among others, exist as to the members of the class:

- a. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with the Labor Code, was willful;
- b. Whether Defendants failed to pay their hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California for all hours worked;
- c. Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class members to work over eight (8) hours per day and/or over forty (40) hours per week and failed to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiff and the other class members;

- 1 d. Whether Defendants properly calculated the regular rate for Plaintiff and
2 the other class members who worked overtime and earned incentive pay;
3 e. Whether Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the other class
4 members legally mandated meal and/or rest periods and failed to
5 compensate them the related premium wages pursuant to Labor Code
6 section 226.7(c);
7 f. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the
8 other class members for all hours worked;
9 g. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other
10 class members within the required time upon their discharge or
11 resignation;
12 h. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the
13 Labor Code, including, *inter alia*, section 226;
14 i. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class
15 members for necessary business-related expenses and costs;
16 j. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
17 k. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of
18 Business & Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*;
19 l. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary
20 penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of the law; and
21 m. Whether Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to
22 compensatory damages pursuant to the Labor Code.

23 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

24 17. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff
25 and other persons as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California.

26 18. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid non-
27 exempt employee during the relevant time period in the State of California.

1 19. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the other class
2 members; to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff's and other class members'
3 employment; and to supervise their daily employment activities.

4 20. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of
5 Plaintiff's and other class members' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff
6 and the other class members.

7 21. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff and the other
8 class members.

9 22. Defendants continue to employ hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the
10 State of California.

11 23. Plaintiff and the other class members worked over eight (8) hours in a day, and/or
12 forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.

13 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
14 engaged in a uniform policy and systematic scheme of wage abuse against their hourly-paid
15 or non-exempt employees within the State of California. This scheme involved, *inter alia*,
16 failing to pay them for all hours worked, and failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest
17 breaks or pay related premium wages in lieu thereof, in violation of the law.

18 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
19 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive
20 certain wages for overtime compensation and that Plaintiff and the other class members were
21 not receiving wages for overtime compensation.

22 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
23 failed to provide Plaintiff and the other class members the required meal and rest periods
24 during the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC")
25 Wage Orders and thus they are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

26 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
27 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive
28 all timely and complete meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's

1 and the other class members' regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, late or
2 interrupted, and that Plaintiff and the other class members did not receive all timely and proper
3 meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a meal
4 period was missed.

5 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
6 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other class members were entitled to receive all
7 timely rest periods without interruption or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's
8 and the other class members' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, late or
9 interrupted, and that Plaintiff and the other class members did not receive all rest periods or
10 payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a rest period was
11 missed.

12 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
13 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive
14 at least minimum wages for compensation and that Plaintiff and the other class members were
15 not receiving at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

16 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
17 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive
18 the wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including overtime and minimum
19 wages and meal and rest period premiums, and that Plaintiff and the other class members did
20 not, in fact, receive such wages owed to them at the time of their discharge or resignation.

21 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
22 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive
23 complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with the law, but, in fact, Plaintiff and
24 the other class members did not receive complete and accurate wage statements from
25 Defendants. The deficiencies included, *inter alia*, the failure to include the total number of
26 hours worked by Plaintiff and the other class members.

27 ///

28 ///

1 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
2 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to
3 reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses.

4 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
5 knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and the other class
6 members pursuant to the law, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such
7 compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely
8 represented to Plaintiff and the other class members that they were properly denied wages, all
9 in order to increase Defendants' profits.

10 34. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
11 overtime wages to Plaintiff and the other class members for all hours worked. Plaintiff and
12 other class members were required to work more than eight (8) hours per day and/or more
13 than forty (40) hours per week without overtime compensation.

14 35. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide the
15 requisite uninterrupted and timely meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class
16 members.

17 36. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
18 Plaintiff and the other class members at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

19 37. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
20 Plaintiff and the other class members the wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation.

21 38. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide
22 complete or accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and the other class members.

23 39. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to reimburse
24 Plaintiff and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses.

25 40. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to properly
26 compensate Plaintiff and the other class members pursuant to the law in order to increase
27 Defendants' profits.

28 ///

1 period per day of the employee is no more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived
2 by mutual consent of both the employer and employee.

3 55. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order
4 and Labor Code section 512(a) further provide that an employer may not require, cause, or
5 permit an employee to work for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without
6 providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30)
7 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12) hours, the second
8 meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the
9 first meal period was not waived.

10 56. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiff and the other class
11 members who were scheduled to work for a period of time no longer than six (6) hours, and
12 who did not waive their legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to
13 work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less
14 than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

15 57. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiff and the other class
16 members who were scheduled to work for a period of time no longer than twelve (12) hours,
17 and who did not waive their legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required
18 to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less
19 than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

20 58. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiff and the other class
21 members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of six (6) hours were
22 required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period
23 of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

24 59. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiff and the other class
25 members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of twelve (12) hours were
26 required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without an uninterrupted meal period
27 of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

28 ///

1 60. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants intentionally and
2 willfully required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during meal periods and failed
3 to compensate Plaintiff and the other class members the full meal period premium for work
4 performed during meal periods.

5 61. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
6 Plaintiff and the other class members the full meal period premium due pursuant to Labor
7 Code section 226.7.

8 62. Defendants' conduct violates the applicable IWC Wage Order and Labor Code
9 sections 226.7 and 512(a).

10 63. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and Labor Code section 226.7(c),
11 Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional
12 hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal
13 period was not provided.

14 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7)**

16 **(Against AVALON TRANSPORTATION, LLC, VIRGIN FISH, INC., and DOES 1**
17 **through 100)**

18 64. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
19 through 63, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
20 forth herein.

21 65. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order
22 and Labor Code section 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiff's and the other class members'
23 employment by Defendants.

24 66. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Labor Code section 226.7
25 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated
26 by an applicable order of the IWC.

27 ///

28 ///

1 67. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order
2 provides that “[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods,
3 which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period” and that the “rest
4 period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net
5 rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof” unless the total daily work time is less
6 than three and one-half (3 ½) hours.

7 68. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants required Plaintiff
8 and the other class members to work four (4) or more hours without authorizing or permitting
9 a ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period worked.

10 69. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants willfully required
11 Plaintiff and the other class members to work during rest periods and failed to pay Plaintiff
12 and the other class members the full rest period premium for work performed during rest
13 periods.

14 70. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
15 Plaintiff and the other class members the full rest period premium due pursuant to Labor Code
16 section 226.7.

17 71. Defendants’ conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code
18 section 226.7.

19 72. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code section 226.7(c),
20 Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional
21 hour of pay at the employee’s regular hourly rate of compensation for each workday that the
22 rest period was not provided.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

2

3
4

5
6
7

8
9
0

- 1
- 2
- 3

4
5
6
7
8

9
0
1

2

3

4
5

6
7
8

79. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Labor Code sections 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits their employment, their wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of their intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to their wages at the time of quitting.

80. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

81. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

82. Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

83. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the statutory penalty wages for each day they were not paid, up to the thirty (30) day maximum as provided by Labor Code section 203.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a))

(Against AVALON TRANSPORTATION, LLC, VIRGIN FISH, INC., and DOES 1 through 100)

84. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 83, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

/ / /

1 85. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Labor Code section 226(a)
2 provides that every employer shall furnish each of their employees an accurate itemized
3 statement in writing showing: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee,
4 (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid
5 on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders
6 of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the
7 inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and
8 only the last four digits of their social security number or an employee identification number
9 other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the
10 employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
11 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. The deductions
12 made from payments of wages shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly dated,
13 showing the month, day, and year, and a copy of the statement and the record of the deductions
14 shall be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of employment or at
15 a central location within the State of California.

16 86. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the
17 other class members with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include,
18 but are not limited to, the failure to include the total number of hours worked by Plaintiff and
19 other class members.

20 87. As a result of Defendants' violation of Labor Code section 226(a), Plaintiff and
21 the other class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

22 88. Plaintiff and the other class members have been injured by Defendants'
23 intentional and willful violation of Labor Code section 226(a) because they were denied both
24 their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate and itemized
25 wage statements pursuant to Labor Code section 226(a).

26 89. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the
27 greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code
28 section 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars per employee.

1 90. Plaintiff and the other class members are also entitled to injunctive relief to
2 ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to Labor Code section 226(h).

3 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802)**

5 **(Against AVALON TRANSPORTATION, LLC, VIRGIN FISH, INC., and DOES 1**
6 **through 100)**

7 91. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
8 through 90, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
9 forth herein.

10 92. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must reimburse its
11 employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the
12 discharge of their job duties or in direct consequence of their obedience to the directions of the
13 employer.

14 93. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the
15 other class members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs. Plaintiff and the
16 other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants their business-related expenses and
17 costs incurred during the course and scope of their employment, plus interest accrued from the
18 date on which the employee incurred the necessary expenditures at the same rate as judgments
19 in civil actions in the State of California.

20 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **(Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)**

22 **(Against AVALON TRANSPORTATION, LLC, VIRGIN FISH, INC., and DOES 1**
23 **through 100)**

24 94. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
25 through 93, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
26 forth herein.

27 ///

28 ///

1 95. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be unfair,
2 unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff, the other class members, to the general public, and
3 Defendants' competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the
4 public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

5 96. Defendants' activities as alleged herein are violations of the law, and constitute
6 unlawful business acts and practices in violation of Business & Professions Code sections
7 17200, *et seq.*

8 97. A violation of Business & Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.* may be
9 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants' policy
10 and practice of requiring Plaintiff and the other class members work overtime hours without
11 paying them proper compensation violate Labor Code sections 510 and 1198. Additionally,
12 Defendants' policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and the other class members to work
13 through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper compensation violate Labor
14 Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Moreover, Defendants' policy and practice of failing to
15 timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other class members violate Labor Code sections 201
16 and 202. Defendants also violated Labor Code sections 226(a), 1194, 1197, 2800, and 2802.

17 98. As a result of the herein described violations of the law, Defendants unlawfully
18 gained an unfair advantage over other businesses.

19 99. Plaintiff and the other class members have been personally injured by
20 Defendants' unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not
21 necessarily limited to the loss of money and/or property.

22 100. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiff and
23 the other class members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by
24 Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this Complaint;
25 an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to Code of Civil procedure section 1021.5 and other
26 applicable laws; and an award of costs.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*)**

3 **(Against AVALON TRANSPORTATION, LLC, VIRGIN FISH, INC., and DOES 1**
4 **through 100)**

5 101. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
6 through 100, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully
7 set forth herein.

8 102. The Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”) expressly establishes that
9 any provision of the Labor Code which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected
10 by the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”), or any of its
11 departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for a violation of the
12 Labor Code, may be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on
13 behalf of himself or herself, and other current or former employees.

14 103. On December 13, 2023, written notice was provided to the LWDA and
15 Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that were violated, and the theories
16 supporting those violations. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** and incorporated by reference is a
17 copy of the written notice to the LWDA.

18 104. On January 2, 2024, Plaintiff amended the written notice to the LWDA and
19 Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code he contends were violated, and the
20 theories supporting his contentions. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 2** and incorporated by
21 reference is a copy of the amended written notice to the LWDA. Plaintiff believes that on or
22 about March 7, 2024, the sixty-five (65) days expired as to all Defendants, and the LWDA did
23 not take any action to investigate or prosecute this matter. Therefore, Plaintiff has exhausted
24 his administrative remedies.

25 105. Plaintiff and the other employees are “aggrieved employees” as defined by
26 Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt
27 employees of Defendants within the State of California at any time from June 12, 2024,
28 through June 7, 2025, excluding exclusively non-chauffeur drivers, and one or more of the

1 alleged violations was committed against them.

2 **Failure to Pay Minimum and Overtime Wages**

3 97. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to compensate their non-
4 exempt employees minimum wages for all hours worked and overtime wages for all hours
5 worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a workweek, pursuant to the
6 mandate of Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198.

7 98. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the other
8 aggrieved current and former employees for all hours worked, resulting in a failure to pay all
9 minimum wages and overtime wages, where applicable.

10 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Rest Breaks**

11 99. In accordance with the mandates of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512,
12 Defendants were required to authorize and permit their non-exempt employees to take a 10-
13 minute rest break for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof, and were further
14 required to provide their non-exempt employees with a 30-minute meal period for every five
15 (5) hours worked.

16 100. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the other
17 aggrieved current and former employees with legally-mandated meal periods and rest breaks
18 and failed to pay proper compensation for this failure.

19 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment**

20 101. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their employees
21 within a specified time period pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code section 204.

22 102. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other
23 aggrieved current and former employees all wages due and owing them within the required time
24 period.

25 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination**

26 103. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their employees all
27 wages owed in a timely fashion at the end of employment pursuant to Labor Code sections 201
28 to 204.

1 104. As a result of Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged above, Defendants
2 failed to pay Plaintiff and the other aggrieved former employees their final wages pursuant to
3 Labor Code sections 201 to 204 and accordingly owe waiting time penalties pursuant to section
4 203.

5 **Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements**

6 105. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to keep *accurate* records
7 regarding their California employees pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code sections 226 and
8 1174.

9 106. As a result of Defendants' various Labor Code violations, Defendants failed to
10 keep accurate records regarding Plaintiff and the other aggrieved current and former employees.
11 For example, Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep accurate records
12 regarding Plaintiff and the other aggrieved current and former employees' gross wages earned,
13 total hours worked, all deductions, net wages earned, and all applicable hourly rates and the
14 number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

15 **Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses**

16 107. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to reimburse its employees
17 for any and all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employees in direct
18 consequences of the discharge or his or her duties pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code
19 sections 2800 and 2802.

20 108. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other
21 aggrieved current and former employees for all business expenses incurred and owing them
22 within the required time period.

23 **Penalties**

24 109. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of
25 other current and former aggrieved employees, requests and is entitled to recover from
26 Defendants, and each of them, civil penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs, including but
27 not limited to:

28 ///

- 1 a. Penalties under Labor Code section 2699 in the amount of a hundred dollars
2 (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation,
3 and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period
4 for each subsequent violation;
- 5 b. Penalties under Code of Regulations Title 8 section 11040 in the amount of
6 fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial
7 violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per
8 pay period for each subsequent violation;
- 9 c. Penalties under Labor Code section 210 in addition to, and entirely
10 independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the Labor Code
11 in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per
12 pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each
13 aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- 14 d. Penalties under Labor Code section 1197.1 in the amount of a hundred
15 dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial
16 violation, and two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved employee
17 per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- 18 e. Any and all additional penalties as provided by the Labor Code and/or other
19 statutes; and
- 20 f. Attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 1194, and
21 2699, and any other applicable statute.

22 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

23 Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly
24 situated, requests a trial by jury.

25 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

26 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all other members of the
27 general public similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and
28 severally, as follows:

Class Certification

1. That this action be certified as a class action;
2. That Plaintiff be appointed as representative of the Class;
3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel; and
4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel immediately the names and most current contact information (address, e-mail, and telephone numbers) of all class members.

As to the First Cause of Action

5. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members;
6. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages as may be appropriate for pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
7. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to Labor Code section 1194; and
8. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Second Cause of Action

9. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiff and the other class members;
10. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other class members of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not provided;
11. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
12. For premium wages pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7(c);
13. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

1 14. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

2 15. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

3 **As to the Third Cause of Action**

4 16. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code
5 section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all rest periods
6 to Plaintiff and the other class members;

7 17. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other class members of one
8 (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest
9 period was not provided; For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages,
10 according to proof;

11 18. For premium wages pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7(c);

12
13 19. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were
14 due; and

15 20. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

16 **As to the Fourth Cause of Action**

17 21. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code
18 sections 1194 and 1197 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other
19 class members;

20 22. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be
21 appropriate;

22 23. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such
23 amounts were due;

24 24. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to Labor
25 Code section 1194(a);

26 25. For liquidated damages pursuant to Labor Code section 1194.2; and

27 26. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

28 ///

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

27. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment of Plaintiff and the other class members no longer employed by Defendants;

28. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

29. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 203 for the class members who have left Defendants' employ; For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts were due; and

30. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

31. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of Labor Code section 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders as to Plaintiff and the other class members, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

32. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

33. For statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 226(e);

34. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to Labor Code section 226(h); and

35. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

36. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for all necessary business-related expenses as required by Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

37. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

38. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;

39. For punitive damages and/or exemplary damages according to proof at trial;

40. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

41. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

42. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Business & Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.* by failing to provide Plaintiff and the other class members all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay Plaintiff's and the other class members' wages timely as required by Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

43. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and other class members and all pre-judgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

44. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a result of violation of Business & Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*;

45. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;

46. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to Business & Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*; and

For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

47. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*, the PAGA, for civil penalties pursuant to Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802;

48. Upon the Cause of Action, for costs and attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 1194, and 2699, and any other applicable statute; and

///

///

49. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: July 7, 2025

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

By: D. Han

Douglas Han

Shunt Tatavos-Gharajeh

Christopher Petersen

Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT 1

December 13, 2023

BY U.S. MAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov State of
California
Labor & Workforce Development Agency 800
Capitol Mall, MIC-55
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: AVALON TRANSPORTATION, LLC and VIRGIN FISH, INC.

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Dale Payne against Avalon Transportation, LLC and Virgin Fish, Inc. (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer or managing agent acting on behalf of an "Employer" pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 1-20¹ for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter collectively referred to as "AVALON").

Mr. Payne is pursuing his California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") claim on a representative basis. Therefore, Mr. Payne may seek penalties for violations of the Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and aggrieved employees, which are recoverable under PAGA. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Avalon Transportation, LLC is a California limited liability company located at 1000 Corporate Pointe, Unit 150, Culver City, California 90230. Virgin Fish, Inc. is a California corporation located at 1000 Corporate Pointe, Unit 150, Culver City, California 90230.

AVALON employed Mr. Payne as an hourly-paid non-exempt Chauffeur within one year of the date of this letter (until or until around July 2023) in the State of California. AVALON directly controlled the wages, hours and/or working conditions of Mr. Payne's and other aggrieved employees' employment, including direction, retention, scheduling, supervision, and termination.

///

¹ Mr. Payne does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and for that reason, said DOES are designated under such fictitious names. Mr. Payne will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Mr. Payne is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Mr. Payne and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

The “aggrieved employees” that Mr. Payne may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through a staffing agency) of AVALON within the State of California.

AVALON failed to properly pay its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees for all hours worked, failed to properly compensate minimum and overtime wages, failed to properly provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks or pay premium wages in lieu thereof, failed to issue compliant wage statements, and failed to reimburse for all necessary business- related costs and expenses, thus resulting in Labor Code violations as stated below.

Pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751, an employee who brings a representative action and was affected by at least one of the violations alleged in the complaint has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state not only for that violation, but for violations affecting other employees as well. Accordingly, Mr. Payne has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all aggrieved employees at AVALON, regardless of their classification, job title, location, or whether they were hired directly or through a staffing agency.

AVALON has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 require employers to pay time- and-a-half or double-time overtime wages and make it unlawful to work employees for hours longer than eight hours in one day and/or over forty hours in one week without paying the premium overtime rates. During the relevant time period, Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. AVALON failed to compensate Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks.

AVALON also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses into aggrieved employees’ regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all overtime hours worked.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 246 requires that employers provide employees with paid sick leave of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked. California Labor Code section 246(l) also requires that paid sick leave be paid at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

During the relevant time period, AVALON failed to pay aggrieved employees paid sick leave that complied with California Labor Code section 246, by, for example, failing to pay paid sick leave at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a meal or rest break is not provided. During the relevant time period, AVALON routinely required Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with AVALON's policies and expectations and serve customers. AVALON failed to provide coverage to Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees so they may be relieved of all work duties and take legally mandated meal and rest breaks. Lastly, AVALON failed to authorize and permit Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees to take the requisite number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length. Despite these facts, AVALON failed to compensate Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed, including failing to pay premium wages at aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay.

California Labor Code section 551 states "[e]very person employed in any occupation of labor is entitled to one day's rest therefrom in seven." Section 552 further states "[n]o employer of labor shall cause his employees to work more than six days in seven." AVALON required aggrieved employees to work seven days in a row or more without one day's rest.

California Labor Code section 432.5 states "[n]o employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof, shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof to be prohibited by law." AVALON required aggrieved employees to execute arbitration agreements as a condition of employment despite knowing that such agreements are prohibited under Labor Code section 432.6.

///

///

California Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits their employment, their wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours' previous notice of their intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to their wages at the time of quitting. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days. During the relevant time period, AVALON failed to pay Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees all wages, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 and therefore is liable under California Labor Code sections 203 and 210.

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, AVALON failed to pay Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204, and is therefore liable under California Labor Code section 210.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, AVALON did not provide Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from AVALON were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross wages earned by Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees, (4) all deductions for Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved employee and only the last four digits of their social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code section 558 allows recovery of penalties. Pursuant to the code, (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order 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 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. Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees have been denied their wages and premium wages and, therefore, are entitled to penalties.

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, 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 any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, AVALON failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid to Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees.

///

///

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, AVALON did not provide Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of their job duties or in direct consequence of their obedience to the directions of the employer. During their employment, Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by AVALON, including for purchasing equipment they were required to wear while working and using their personal cell phones and vehicles for work-related purposes.

We believe that Mr. Payne and other current and former California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are entitled to penalties as allowed under California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter to the employer in question and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency setting forth the claims, and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this letter is to satisfy the requirement created by California Labor Code section 2699 prior to seeking penalties allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations. We look forward to determining whether California Labor & Workforce Development Agency intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly request that you respond to this notice according to the time frame contemplated by the California Labor Code.

Mr. Payne will seek these penalties on his own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of AVALON within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

///

///

LWDA
December 13, 2023
Page 7 of 7

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.
Thank you for your attention to this matter and the noble cause you advance each and every day.

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Han', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Douglas Han, Esq.

CC: (By Certified U.S. Mail Only):

Barry Weizs
c/o Avalon Transportation, LLC 2029
Century Park E
Los Angeles, California 90067
Agent for Service of Process for Avalon Transportation, LLC

Barry Weiss Thompson Coburn
LLP
c/o Virgin Fish, Inc.
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., Unit 500 Los
Angeles, California 90067
Agent for Service of Process for Virgin Fish, Inc.

Legal Department
c/o Avalon Transportation, LLC 1000
Corporate Pointe, Unit 150 Culver City,
California 90230

Legal Department c/o
Virgin Fish, Inc.
1000 Corporate Pointe, Unit 150 Culver
City, California 90230

EXHIBIT 2

January 2, 2024

BY U.S. MAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov State of
California
Labor & Workforce Development Agency 800
Capitol Mall, MIC-55
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: AVALON TRANSPORTATION, LLC and VIRGIN FISH, INC. LWDA
Case No. 999551-23

Dear Representative:

We hereby amend our December 13, 2023, letter sent to your office in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3. A true and correct copy of the December 13, 2023, letter is attached to this submission as **Exhibit A** for reference. We are amending that letter to replace the named representative of aggrieved employees, Dale Payne, with Kamil Al-Ahdali. Further investigation has revealed that Mr. Payne was not employed by the “employers” listed in the December 13, 2023, letter and that Mr. Al-Ahdali is instead a suitable representative.

We have been retained to represent Kamil Al-Ahdali against Avalon Transportation, LLC and Virgin Fish, Inc. (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer or managing agent acting on behalf of an “Employer” pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 1-20¹ for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter collectively referred to as “AVALON”).

Mr. Al-Ahdali is pursuing his California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”) claim on a representative basis. Therefore, Mr. Al-Ahdali may seek penalties for violations of the Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and aggrieved employees, which are recoverable under PAGA. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

///

¹ Mr. Al-Ahdali does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and for that reason, said DOES are designated under such fictitious names. Mr. Al-Ahdali will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Mr. Al-Ahdali is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Mr. Al-Ahdali and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

LWDA

January 2, 2024

Page 2 of 8

Avalon Transportation, LLC is a California limited liability company located at 1000 Corporate Pointe, Unit 150, Culver City, California 90230. Virgin Fish, Inc. is a California corporation located at 1000 Corporate Pointe, Unit 150, Culver City, California 90230.

AVALON employed Mr. Al-Ahdali as an hourly-paid non-exempt Chauffeur during the relevant time period in the State of California. AVALON directly controlled the wages, hours and/or working conditions of Mr. Al-Ahdali's and other aggrieved employees' employment, including direction, retention, scheduling, supervision, and termination.

The "aggrieved employees" that Mr. Al-Ahdali may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through a staffing agency) of AVALON within the State of California.

AVALON failed to properly pay its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees for all hours worked, failed to properly compensate minimum and overtime wages, failed to properly provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks or pay premium wages in lieu thereof, failed to issue compliant wage statements, and failed to reimburse for all necessary business- related costs and expenses, thus resulting in Labor Code violations as stated below.

Pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751, an employee who brings a representative action and was affected by at least one of the violations alleged in the complaint has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state not only for that violation, but for violations affecting other employees as well. Accordingly, Mr. Al-Ahdali has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all aggrieved employees at AVALON, regardless of their classification, job title, location, or whether they were hired directly or through a staffing agency.

AVALON has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

///

///

///

California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 require employers to pay time- and-a-half or double-time overtime wages and make it unlawful to work employees for hours longer than eight hours in one day and/or over forty hours in one week without paying the premium overtime rates. During the relevant time period, Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. AVALON failed to compensate Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks.

AVALON also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses into aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all overtime hours worked.

California Labor Code section 246 requires that employers provide employees with paid sick leave of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked. California Labor Code section 246(l) also requires that paid sick leave be paid at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

During the relevant time period, AVALON failed to pay aggrieved employees paid sick leave that complied with California Labor Code section 246, by, for example, failing to pay paid sick leave at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a meal or rest break is not provided. During the relevant time period, AVALON routinely required Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with AVALON's policies and expectations and serve customers. AVALON failed to provide coverage to Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees so they may be relieved of all work duties and take legally mandated meal and rest breaks. Lastly, AVALON failed to authorize and permit Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees to take the requisite number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length. Despite these facts, AVALON failed to compensate Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed, including failing to pay premium wages at aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay.

///

///

California Labor Code section 551 states “[e]very person employed in any occupation of labor is entitled to one day’s rest therefrom in seven.” Section 552 further states “[n]o employer of labor shall cause his employees to work more than six days in seven.” AVALON required aggrieved employees to work seven days in a row or more without one day’s rest.

California Labor Code section 432.5 states “[n]o employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof, shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof to be prohibited by law.” AVALON required aggrieved employees to execute arbitration agreements as a condition of employment despite knowing that such agreements are prohibited under Labor Code section 432.6.

California Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits their employment, their wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours’ previous notice of their intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to their wages at the time of quitting. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days. During the relevant time period, AVALON failed to pay Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees all wages, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 and therefore is liable under California Labor Code sections 203 and 210.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, AVALON failed to pay Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204, and is therefore liable under California Labor Code section 210.

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, AVALON did not provide Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from AVALON were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross wages earned by Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees, (4) all deductions for Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved employee and only the last four digits of their social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by aggrieved employees.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 558 allows recovery of penalties. Pursuant to the code, (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order 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 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. Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees have been denied their wages and premium wages and, therefore, are entitled to penalties.

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, 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 any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, AVALON failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid to Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, AVALON did not provide Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of their job duties or in direct consequence of their obedience to the directions of the employer. During their employment, Mr. Al-Ahdali and other aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by AVALON, including for purchasing tickets they were required to use while working and using their personal cell phones and vehicles for work-related purposes.

We believe that Mr. Al-Ahdali and other current and former California-based hourly- paid or non-exempt employees are entitled to penalties as allowed under California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

LWDA

January 2, 2024

Page 7 of 8

California Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter to the employer in question and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency setting forth the claims, and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this letter is to satisfy the requirement created by California Labor Code section 2699 prior to seeking penalties allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations. We look forward to determining whether California Labor & Workforce Development Agency intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly request that you respond to this notice according to the time frame contemplated by the California Labor Code.

Mr. Al-Ahdali will seek these penalties on his own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of AVALON within one year of the date of the original December 13, 2023 letter, as allowed by law.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter and the noble cause you advance each and every day.

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Han', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Douglas Han, Esq.

CC: (By Certified U.S. Mail Only):

Barry Weiss Thompson Coburn
LLP
c/o Virgin Fish, Inc.
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., Unit 500 Los
Angeles, California 90067
Agent for Service of Process for Virgin Fish, Inc.

Legal Department
c/o Avalon Transportation, LLC 1000
Corporate Pointe, Unit 150 Culver City,
California 90230

LWDA

January 2, 2024

Page 8 of 8

Legal Department c/o

Virgin Fish, Inc.

1000 Corporate Pointe, Unit 150 Culver

City, California 90230

EXHIBIT A

December 13, 2023

BY U.S. MAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov State of
California
Labor & Workforce Development Agency 800
Capitol Mall, MIC-55
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: AVALON TRANSPORTATION, LLC and VIRGIN FISH, INC.

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Dale Payne against Avalon Transportation, LLC and Virgin Fish, Inc. (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer or managing agent acting on behalf of an "Employer" pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 1-20¹ for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter collectively referred to as "AVALON").

Mr. Payne is pursuing his California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") claim on a representative basis. Therefore, Mr. Payne may seek penalties for violations of the Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and aggrieved employees, which are recoverable under PAGA. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Avalon Transportation, LLC is a California limited liability company located at 1000 Corporate Pointe, Unit 150, Culver City, California 90230. Virgin Fish, Inc. is a California corporation located at 1000 Corporate Pointe, Unit 150, Culver City, California 90230.

AVALON employed Mr. Payne as an hourly-paid non-exempt Chauffeur within one year of the date of this letter (until or until around July 2023) in the State of California. AVALON directly controlled the wages, hours and/or working conditions of Mr. Payne's and other aggrieved employees' employment, including direction, retention, scheduling, supervision, and termination.

///

¹ Mr. Payne does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and for that reason, said DOES are designated under such fictitious names. Mr. Payne will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Mr. Payne is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Mr. Payne and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

The “aggrieved employees” that Mr. Payne may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through a staffing agency) of AVALON within the State of California.

AVALON failed to properly pay its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees for all hours worked, failed to properly compensate minimum and overtime wages, failed to properly provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks or pay premium wages in lieu thereof, failed to issue compliant wage statements, and failed to reimburse for all necessary business- related costs and expenses, thus resulting in Labor Code violations as stated below.

Pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751, an employee who brings a representative action and was affected by at least one of the violations alleged in the complaint has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state not only for that violation, but for violations affecting other employees as well. Accordingly, Mr. Payne has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all aggrieved employees at AVALON, regardless of their classification, job title, location, or whether they were hired directly or through a staffing agency.

AVALON has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 require employers to pay time- and-a-half or double-time overtime wages and make it unlawful to work employees for hours longer than eight hours in one day and/or over forty hours in one week without paying the premium overtime rates. During the relevant time period, Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. AVALON failed to compensate Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks. AVALON also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses into aggrieved employees’ regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all overtime hours worked.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 246 requires that employers provide employees with paid sick leave of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked. California Labor Code section 246(l) also requires that paid sick leave be paid at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

During the relevant time period, AVALON failed to pay aggrieved employees paid sick leave that complied with California Labor Code section 246, by, for example, failing to pay paid sick leave at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a meal or rest break is not provided. During the relevant time period, AVALON routinely required Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with AVALON's policies and expectations and serve customers. AVALON failed to provide coverage to Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees so they may be relieved of all work duties and take legally mandated meal and rest breaks. Lastly, AVALON failed to authorize and permit Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees to take the requisite number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length. Despite these facts, AVALON failed to compensate Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed, including failing to pay premium wages at aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay.

California Labor Code section 551 states "[e]very person employed in any occupation of labor is entitled to one day's rest therefrom in seven." Section 552 further states "[n]o employer of labor shall cause his employees to work more than six days in seven." AVALON required aggrieved employees to work seven days in a row or more without one day's rest.

California Labor Code section 432.5 states "[n]o employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof, shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof to be prohibited by law." AVALON required aggrieved employees to execute arbitration agreements as a condition of employment despite knowing that such agreements are prohibited under Labor Code section 432.6.

///

///

California Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits their employment, their wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours' previous notice of their intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to their wages at the time of quitting. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days. During the relevant time period, AVALON failed to pay Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees all wages, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 and therefore is liable under California Labor Code sections 203 and 210.

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, AVALON failed to pay Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204, and is therefore liable under California Labor Code section 210.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, AVALON did not provide Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from AVALON were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross wages earned by Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees, (4) all deductions for Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved employee and only the last four digits of their social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code section 558 allows recovery of penalties. Pursuant to the code, (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order 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 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. Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees have been denied their wages and premium wages and, therefore, are entitled to penalties.

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, 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 any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, AVALON failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid to Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees.

///

///

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, AVALON did not provide Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of their job duties or in direct consequence of their obedience to the directions of the employer. During their employment, Mr. Payne and other aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by AVALON, including for purchasing equipment they were required to wear while working and using their personal cell phones and vehicles for work-related purposes.

We believe that Mr. Payne and other current and former California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are entitled to penalties as allowed under California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter to the employer in question and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency setting forth the claims, and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this letter is to satisfy the requirement created by California Labor Code section 2699 prior to seeking penalties allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations. We look forward to determining whether California Labor & Workforce Development Agency intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly request that you respond to this notice according to the time frame contemplated by the California Labor Code.

Mr. Payne will seek these penalties on his own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of AVALON within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

///

///

LWDA
December 13, 2023
Page 7 of 7

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.
Thank you for your attention to this matter and the noble cause you advance each and every day.

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Han', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Douglas Han, Esq.

CC: (By Certified U.S. Mail Only):

Barry Weizs
c/o Avalon Transportation, LLC 2029
Century Park E
Los Angeles, California 90067
Agent for Service of Process for Avalon Transportation, LLC

Barry Weiss Thompson Coburn
LLP
c/o Virgin Fish, Inc.
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., Unit 500 Los
Angeles, California 90067
Agent for Service of Process for Virgin Fish, Inc.

Legal Department
c/o Avalon Transportation, LLC 1000
Corporate Pointe, Unit 150 Culver City,
California 90230

Legal Department c/o
Virgin Fish, Inc.
1000 Corporate Pointe, Unit 150 Culver
City, California 90230

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

PROOF OF SERVICE