

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jovahn Wiggins, Esq. (SBN 349903)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
jwiggins@lelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff RACHAEL LILLIAN CAIN,
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees

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

RACHAEL LILLIAN CAIN, on behalf of herself
and current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

WESTERN DENTAL SERVICES, INC.; and
DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **CVRI 2403441**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF RACHAEL LILLIAN
CAIN'S COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff RACHAEL LILLIAN CAIN ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of herself
and current and former aggrieved employees, who alleges and complains against Defendants
WESTERN DENTAL SERVICES, INC.; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive (collectively
"Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*
("PAGA") representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California, herself
and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-
exempt employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated
with Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all

1 hours worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure
2 to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant meal periods or pay meal period
3 premium wages; failure to authorize or permit all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or
4 pay rest period premium wages; statutory penalties for failure to timely pay earned wages during
5 employment; secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute; statutory penalties for
6 failure to provide accurate wage statements; statutory waiting time penalties in the form of
7 continuation wages for failure to timely pay employees all wages due upon separation of
8 employment. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and
9 Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor
10 Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and
11 others aggrieved.

12 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
14 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
15 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
16 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars
17 (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
18 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
19 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
20 California, including but not limited to Riverside County.

21 **III. PARTIES**

22 3. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
23 Development Agency on behalf of herself and other current and former employees subject to
24 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
25 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will
26 work for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
27 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the
28 currently named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was

1 employed by Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Riverside County from
2 in or around January 2023 to present.

3 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant WESTERN
4 DENTAL SERVICES, INC. is authorized to do business within the State of California and is
5 doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times
6 relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant WESTERN DENTAL SERVICES,
7 INC. in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices
8 or policies. Defendant WESTERN DENTAL SERVICES, INC. operates in Riverside County and
9 employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Riverside County including but not limited to, at
10 Riverside County.

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

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

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

28 8. Plaintiff makes the allegations in this complaint without any admission that, as to

any particular allegation, Plaintiff bears the burden of pleading, proving, or persuading and Plaintiff reserves all of Plaintiff's right to plead in the alternative.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

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

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

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

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

11. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California Labor Code:

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

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

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

1 (a) Automatically deducting 30 minutes from Plaintiff's and other current and former
2 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' daily hours worked and attributing that
3 time to a meal break despite that Defendants routinely failed to provide Plaintiff and other current
4 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' meal breaks and/or duty-
5 free meal breaks; and

6 (b) Failing to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
7 hourly non-exempt employees for all hours worked.

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

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

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

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

1 Labor Code section 510.

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

5 (a) Automatically deducting 30 minutes from Plaintiff's and other current and former
6 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' daily hours worked and attributing that
7 time to a meal break despite that Defendants routinely failed to provide Plaintiff and other current
8 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' meal breaks and/or duty-
9 free meal breaks; and

10 (b) Failing to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
11 hourly non-exempt employees for all hours worked.

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

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

25 21. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an
26 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of
27 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the
28 employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 4 at §11;

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

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

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

17 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
18 hourly non-exempt employees timely, uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes
19 for every five hours worked.

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

26 25. Defendants’ foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff
27 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not
28 receiving wages to compensate them for workdays during which Defendants did not provide them

1 with meal periods in compliance with California law.

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

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

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

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

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

28 30. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or

1 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
2 based hourly non-exempt employees with one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each
3 workday they did not receive legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor
4 Code section 226.7.

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

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

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

25 34. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
26 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
27 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
28 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 40. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor
11 Code section 2699.3. On January 16, 2024, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA
12 and provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific
13 provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to
14 support the violations alleged.

15 41. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by
16 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code
17 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the
18 parties notice within 60 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends
19 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

20 42. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
21 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a),
22 226.7, 510, 512, and 1194, During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present,
23 preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the
24 following amounts:

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

- 1 California Labor Code, including but not limited to sections 210, 225.5, 226.3, 558, 2699(f);
2 3. For attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including but not limited to those recoverable
3 under California Labor Code section 2699(g); and
4 4. For such and other further relief, in law and/or equity, as the Court deems just or
5 appropriate.

6

7 Dated: June 11, 2024

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

8

9

By:



10

Joseph Lavi, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.

11

Jovahn Wiggins, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
RACHAEL LILLIAN CAIN
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved
employees

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28