

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.
William C. Sung, SB# 280792
E-Mail: william@justiceforworkers.com
Tiffany L. Luu, SB# 335127
E-Mail: tluu@justiceforworkers.com
3600 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1815
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Tel: 323-922-2000
Fax: 323-922-2000

Attorneys for Plaintiff JUAN CARLOS CASTELLANOS GARCIA

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
04/25/2024

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
By: R. Lozano Deputy

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT**

JUAN CARLOS CASTELLANOS GARCIA,
an individual and on behalf of all others
similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

MG DRYAWLL CONSTRUCTION INC., a
California corporation; and DOES 1 through
50,

Defendants.

Case No.: 24STCV03488

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

- (1) **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 1182.12, 1194,
1194.2, 1197);
- (2) **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 204, 510, 1194,
1198);
- (3) **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512, 558);
- (4) **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 516, 558);
- (5) **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**
(LABOR CODE §§ 201-203);
- (6) **UNFAIR COMPETITION (BUS &
PROF CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*); and**
- (7) **CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE
CALIFORNIA PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**
(LABOR CODE §§ 2698, *et seq.*)

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff JUAN CARLOS CASTELLANOS GARCIA (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself and
2 all others similarly situated, hereby brings this First Amended Class and Representative Action
3 Complaint (“Complaint”) against Defendants MG DRYWALL CONSTRUCTION INC.
4 (erroneously sued as MG DRYAWLL CONSTRUCTION INC.), a California corporation, and
5 DOES 1 to 50 (collectively “Defendants”), and on information and belief alleges as follows:

6 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

7 1. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby brings this
8 Complaint for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under California Business and Professions
9 Code § 17200, *et seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194,
10 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 2698, *et seq.*, and Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order 16-
11 2001 (“Wage Order 16”), in addition to seeking injunctive relief, declaratory relief, and restitution.
12 This Complaint is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. This Court has
13 jurisdiction over Defendants’ violations of the Labor Code because the amount in controversy
14 exceeds \$25,000.

15 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district because Defendants maintain offices, have
16 agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, including Los Angeles County, and some
17 of the acts and omissions complained of herein occurred in Los Angeles County. Furthermore,
18 Plaintiff was employed by Defendants within Los Angeles County.

19 **PARTIES**

20 3. Plaintiff is, and at all times relevant herein was, an individual over the age of
21 eighteen (18) and is a California resident. Within the statute of limitations periods applicable to
22 each cause of action pled herein, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee.
23 Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or customs complained of
24 herein and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed by Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et*
25 *seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197,
26 1198, 2802, 2698, *et seq.*, and Wage Order 16.

27 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the
28 applicable statute of limitations for each cause of action pled herein and continuing to the present,

1 Defendants engaged in, and continue to engage in, business, and employed Plaintiff and other,
2 similarly-situated non-exempt employees within Los Angeles County, and the State of California
3 and, therefore, were (and are) doing business in Los Angeles County and the State of California.

4 5. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or
5 corporate, of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 50, inclusive, and for that reason, said
6 defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to
7 amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed,
8 and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious defendants, whether individual,
9 partners, or corporate, was responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein,
10 and proximately caused Plaintiff and the Classes (as defined below) to be subject to the unlawful
11 employment practices, wrongs, injuries, and damages complained of herein.

12 6. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of
13 the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendant; and furthermore,
14 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each of the other
15 defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned, were acting
16 within the course and scope of said agency and employment.

17 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
18 material hereto, each of the Defendants named herein was the agent, employee, alter ego and/or
19 joint venturer of, or working in concert with each of the other co-Defendants and was acting within
20 the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity. To the extent
21 said acts, conduct, and omissions were perpetrated by certain Defendants, each of the remaining
22 Defendants confirmed and ratified said acts, conduct, and omissions of the acting Defendants.

23 8. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were members of, and
24 engaged in, a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course and
25 scope of, and in pursuance of, said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise.

26 9. At all times herein mentioned, the acts and omissions of various Defendants, and
27 each of them, concurred and contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and all of the
28 other Defendants in proximately causing the injuries and damages as herein alleged.

1 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

2 10. Defendants own and operate drywall installation company in Sylmar, California.
3 Defendants have employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee since approximately
4 May or June 2023 as a drywall finisher.

5 11. Throughout Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Defendants' timekeeping
6 and/or payroll policies and practices resulted in Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees not being
7 compensated for all hours actually worked. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees regularly
8 worked more than eight hours in a workday or 40 hours in a workweek. However, Defendants
9 instituted a scheme to avoid paying overtime to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees by
10 unlawfully shaving their hours worked when issuing payroll to give the appearance that Plaintiff
11 and other aggrieved employees did not work overtime hours and failed to compensate them for all
12 hours worked. As a result, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not compensated for all
13 earned minimum and overtime wages.

14 12. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with all
15 legally compliant meal periods due to Defendants' meal period policies/practices, which have
16 frequently resulted in late (commencing after the fifth hour of work), short (less than 30 minutes),
17 and/or missed meal periods. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff and other non-exempt
18 employees were not able to take their legally compliant meal breaks due to work demands imposed
19 by Defendants. Upon information and belief, Defendants do not keep accurate records of Plaintiff's
20 and other non-exempt employees' hours worked, including accurate time records showing when
21 employees take their meal periods. On those occasions when Plaintiff and other non-exempt
22 employees were not provided with all legally compliant meal periods to which they were entitled,
23 Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with the required meal
24 period premium(s) for each workday there was a meal period violation as mandated by Labor Code
25 § 226.7. Upon information and belief, Defendants maintained no mechanism for the payment of
26 meal period premium payments as required by Labor Code § 226.7 in the event that a legally
27 compliant meal period was not provided to their non-exempt employees.

28 ///

13. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not authorized and permitted to take all required rest periods due to Defendants' unlawful rest period policies/practices, which failed to authorize and permit a net 10-minute rest period for every four hours worked, or major fraction thereof. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not able to take their legally compliant rest breaks due to work demands imposed by Defendants. On those occasions when Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not authorized and permitted to take all legally compliant rest periods to which they were entitled, Defendants failed to compensate them with the required rest period premium(s) for each workday there was a rest period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon information and belief, Defendants maintained no mechanism for the payment of rest period premium payments as required by Labor Code § 226.7, in the event that a legally compliant rest period was not authorized and permitted to their non-exempt employees.

14. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay all minimum and overtime wages, failure to pay all meal and rest period premium wages, and unlawful timekeeping and payroll practices as alleged above, Defendants maintained inaccurate payroll records and issued inaccurate wage statements to Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees. As a further result of Defendants' failure to pay all minimum and overtime wages, sick leave wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, Defendants failed to timely pay all final wages to other former non-exempt employees upon their separation of employment from Defendants.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

15. **Class Definitions:** Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the following Classes pursuant to § 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure:

a. Minimum Wage Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who were subject to Defendants' timekeeping and payroll policies and/or practices, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.

b. Overtime Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who worked more than eight hours per day and/or 40 hours per week and were subject to Defendants' timekeeping policies and/or practices, during

the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.

- c. Meal Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who: (i) worked at least one shift in excess of 5.0 hours; and/or (ii) worked at least one shift in excess of 10.0 hours, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- d. Rest Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who worked at least one shift of 3.5 or more hours, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- e. Wage Statement Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who received a wage statement, during the one year immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.

16. **Numerosity/Ascertainability**: The members of the Classes are so numerous that joinder of all members would be impractical, if not impossible. The membership of the Classes is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, it is estimated that the members of the Classes number greater than 50 individuals. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants' employment records, including payroll records.

17. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well-Defined Community of Interest**: There are predominant common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and members of the Classes, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members including, without limitation to:

- a. Whether Defendants properly paid all overtime wages to members of the Overtime Class;
- b. Whether Defendants paid at least the minimum wage for all hours worked to members of the Minimum Wage Class;
- c. Whether Defendants provided all legally compliant meal periods or paid meal period premium wages due to members of the Meal Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;

///

- 1 d. Whether Defendants authorized and permitted all legally compliant rest periods or
2 paid all rest period premium wages due to members of the Rest Period Class
3 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516; and
4 e. Whether Defendants furnished legally compliant wage statements to members of the
5 Wage Statement Class pursuant to Labor Code § 226.

6 These common questions of law and fact set forth above are numerous and substantial and
7 stem from Defendants' policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member. As
8 such, the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual
9 class member's showing as to their eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of their damages.

10 18. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Classes because
11 Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the statute(s)
12 of limitations period applicable to each cause of action pled in the Complaint. As alleged herein,
13 Plaintiff, like the members of the Classes, was not paid all minimum and overtime wages owed due
14 to Defendants' timekeeping and payroll policies/practices, was not provided all required meal
15 periods, was not authorized and permitted all rest periods, did not receive premium pay for non-
16 compliant meal and rest periods, and was not provided with accurate, compliant, itemized wage
17 statements.

18 19. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary steps
19 to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the members of the Classes. Moreover, Plaintiff's
20 attorneys are ready, willing and able to fully and adequately represent the members of the Classes
21 and Plaintiff. Plaintiff's attorneys have litigated numerous wage-and-hour class actions in state and
22 federal courts in the past and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the
23 members of the Classes.

24 20. **Superiority:** The Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves an important
25 public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California. These laws
26 and labor standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers who
27 have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to take advantage of superior economic
28 and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of employment. The nature of this

1 action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff and members of the Classes make the class
2 action format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to redress the violations alleged
3 herein. If each employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily
4 gain an unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited
5 resources of each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources.

6 21. Moreover, requiring each member of the Class(es) to pursue an individual remedy
7 would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file
8 an action against their former and/or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and
9 permanent damages to their careers at subsequent employment. The claims of the individual
10 members of the Class are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual prosecution
11 considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending hereto.

12 22. Furthermore, the prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members,
13 even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications
14 with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; and which would establish
15 potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or legal determinations with
16 respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interest
17 of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which would substantially impair or
18 impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. As such, the Classes identified
19 hereinabove are maintainable as classes under § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

20 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**

22 **(Against All Defendants)**

23 23. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
24 fully set forth herein.

25 24. Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1197, and Wage Order 16, § 4 establish the right of
26 employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state or local law.
27 Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal
28 minimum wage as required by Labor Code § 1197 may recover the unpaid balance together with

1 attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid
2 wages and interest accrued thereon. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to conform its
3 pay practices to the requirements of the law by failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the
4 Minimum Wage Class for all hours worked, including, but not limited to, all hours they were
5 subject to the control of Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the Labor Code and
6 Wage Order 16.

7 25. Labor Code § 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an employee under
8 conditions that the IWC prohibits. California Labor Code § 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an
9 employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage is liable to pay those
10 employees the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages in an amount
11 equal to the wages due and interest thereon.

12 26. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of minimum wages, Plaintiff and
13 members of the Minimum Wage Class seek recovery of the balance of unpaid wages, including
14 interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§
15 218.6, 558, 1194, 1194.2, and 1199, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and Civil Code §§ 3287 and
16 3289.

17 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
18 **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS**
19 **(Against All Defendants)**

20 27. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
21 fully set forth herein.

22 28. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1198, and
23 Wage Order 16, § 3, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to all overtime wages
24 and compensation for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure
25 to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

26 29. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly compensate non-
27 exempt employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class, for all overtime hours
28 worked pursuant to Labor Code § 1194 and Wage Order 16. Wage Order 16, § 3 requires an

1 employer to pay an employee one and one-half (1½) times and two times the employee's regular
2 rate of pay for overtime and double time hours work. Defendants caused Plaintiff and members of
3 the Overtime Class to work overtime hours but failed to compensate these employees for all
4 overtime hours actually worked.

5 30. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of overtime wages, Plaintiff and
6 members of the Overtime Class seek recovery of the balance of unpaid overtime wages, including
7 interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§
8 204, 210, 216, 218.6, 510, 1194, and 1198; Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and Civil Code §§
9 3287 and 3289.

10 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**
11 **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
12 **(Against All Defendants)**

13 31. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
14 fully set forth herein.

15 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed
16 in their affirmative obligation to provide all of their non-exempt employees in California, including
17 Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class, with all legally compliant meal periods in
18 accordance with the mandates of the Labor Code and Wage Order 16, § 11.

19 33. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants did not pay an additional hour of pay to
20 Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class at their respective regular rates of compensation, in
21 accordance with California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226.7, and 512.

22 34. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful meal period practices, Plaintiff and
23 members of the Meal Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for meal period
24 violations including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, pursuant to Labor Code
25 §§ 226.7, 512, 558, Wage Order 16, and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 35. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
5 fully set forth herein.

6 36. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and Wage Order 16, § 12 and establish the right of
7 employees to be provided with a rest period of at least 10 minutes for each four-hour period
8 worked, or major fraction thereof. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
9 despite Defendants' failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class
10 to take all legally compliant rest periods as alleged herein, Defendants did not pay these individuals
11 an additional hour of pay at their respective regular rate for the rest periods that they failed to
12 authorize and permit them to take, as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

13 37. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful rest period practices, Plaintiff and
14 members of the Rest Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for rest period violations
15 including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees,
16 and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, Wage Order 16, and Civil Code §§
17 3287 and 3289.

18 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES**

20 **(Against All Defendants)**

21 38. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
22 fully set forth herein.

23 39. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
24 knowingly and intentionally, as a matter of uniform policy and practice, failed to furnish Plaintiff
25 and members of the Wage Statement Class with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements
26 that included, among other requirements, all hours worked, total gross wages earned, all rates of pay
27 and corresponding number of hours worked, total net wages earned, the inclusive dates of the pay
28 period, and/or the correct name and address of the legal entity that is the employer in violation of

1 Labor Code § 226.

2 40. Defendants' failure to furnish Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Class
3 with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements resulted in actual injury, as said failures led
4 to, among other things, the non-payment of minimum and overtime wages and meal and rest period
5 premium wages owed and deprived them of the information necessary to identify the discrepancies
6 in Defendants' reported payroll data.

7 41. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful wage statement practices, Plaintiff and
8 members of the Wage Statement Class seek damages and/or statutory penalties, reasonable
9 attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code § 226.

10 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

12 **(Against All Defendants)**

13 42. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
14 fully set forth herein.

15 43. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business
16 practices in California in violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, by:

- 17 a. failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class all minimum
18 wages due;
- 19 b. failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class all overtime wages due;
- 20 c. failing to provide Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class with all meal
21 periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all meal period premium
22 wages due;
- 23 d. failing to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class all rest
24 periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all rest period premium
25 wages due; and
- 26 e. failing to issue accurate and itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and members of
27 the Wage Statement Class.

28 ///

44. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived Plaintiff and continues to deprive members of the Classes of compensation to which they are legally entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage over Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers and attempting to do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws.

45. Because Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff for himself and on behalf of the members of the Classes, seeks full restitution of monies, as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17208.

46. The acts complained of herein occurred within the last four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint in this action.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT

(Against All Defendants)

47. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

48. Plaintiff, an “aggrieved employee” within the meaning of Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*, acting on behalf of himself and other aggrieved employees (collectively, “Aggrieved Employees”), brings this representative action against Defendants to recover the civil penalties due to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210 and/or 225.5 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$100 for each initial violation and \$250 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per employee per pay period; (4) \$250 for each initial violation and \$1,000 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to

1 Labor Code § 256, a civil penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as
2 waiting time under the terms of Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) \$100 for each initial violation and
3 \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor
4 Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided, based on the following Labor Code
5 violations:

- 6 a. Failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked to Aggrieved Employees in
7 violation of Labor Code § 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198;
- 8 b. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned overtime compensation in violation
9 of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
- 10 c. Failing to provide all legally required meal periods, and failure to pay meal period
11 premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of compensation in
12 violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, and 1198;
- 13 d. Failing to authorize and permit all legally required rest periods, and failure to pay
14 rest period premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of
15 compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198;
- 16 e. Failing to furnish Aggrieved Employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage
17 statements in violation of Labor Code § 226;
- 18 f. Failing to timely pay all final wages and compensation earned by Aggrieved
19 Employees at the time of separation in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-202;
- 20 g. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned wages at least twice during each
21 calendar month in violation of Labor Code § 204; and
- 22 h. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Aggrieved Employees in violation
23 of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1198.

24 49. On or about February 8, 2024, Plaintiff notified Defendants via certified mail, and
25 notified the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) via its website, of
26 Defendants’ violations of the Labor Code and Plaintiff’s intent to bring a claim for civil penalties
27 under Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* with respect to the violations of the Labor Code identified in the
28 preceding paragraph. Now that 33 days and 65 days have passed from Plaintiff notifying

1 Defendants and the LWDA of these violations, Defendants have not cured any curable violations,
2 and the LWDA has not provided notice that it intends to investigate the violations, Plaintiff has
3 exhausted administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act
4 with respect to these violations.

5 50. Plaintiff has incurred attorneys' fees and costs, which Plaintiff is entitled to receive
6 under California Labor Code § 2699(g).

7 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

8 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for himself and for all others on whose behalf
9 this suit is brought against Defendants, as follows:

- 10 1. For an order certifying the proposed Classes;
- 11 2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the Classes;
- 12 3. For an order appointing Counsel for Plaintiff as Counsel for the Classes;
- 13 4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for payment of minimum wages, liquidated
14 damages, and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, and
15 1197;
- 16 5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for payment of overtime wages and penalties
17 according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
- 18 6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for meal period premium wages according to proof
19 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558;
- 20 7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for rest period premium wages according to proof
21 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558;
- 22 8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code §
23 226;
- 24 9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiff and members of the
25 Classes of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or
26 practices declared by this Court to be in violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et*
27 *seq.*;

28 ///

1 10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other
2 Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§
3 558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each
4 failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional
5 violation pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210 and/or 225.5 for each failure to pay each employee, plus
6 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each
7 subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$100.00 for
8 each initial violation and \$250.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1
9 per employee per pay period; (4) \$250.00 for each initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each
10 subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to
11 Labor Code § 256, a civil penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as
12 waiting time under the terms of Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) \$100.00 for each initial violation and
13 \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor
14 Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided;

15 11. Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6
16 and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289;

17 12. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code §§
18 218.5, 226, 1194, 2699(g), and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

19 13. For such other and further relief, the Court may deem just and proper.
20

21 DATED: April 25, 2024

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.

22
23 By: 

24 William C. Sung

25 Tiffany L. Luu

26 Attorneys for Plaintiff JUAN CARLOS
27 CASTELLANOS GARCIA
28

PROOF OF SERVICE
JUAN CARLOS CASTELLANOS GARCIA v. MG DRYWALL CONSTRUCTION INC.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 3600 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1815, Los Angeles, CA 90010.

On April 25, 2024 I served the foregoing document described as:

FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT

☐ by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail in the State of California addressed as set forth below:

☐ by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as stated on the attached mailing list.

☒ by electronically serving the document(s) listed above to:

Mario D. Vega, Esq.
<mailto:mvega@vistaslawgroup.com>
Margarita Martinez
mmartinez@vistaslawgroup.com
Emmanuel Vergara
evergara@vistaslawgroup.com
VISTAS LAW GROUP, LLP
1150 S. Olive Street
Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Attorney for MG Drywall Construction Inc.

☐ by having copies **personally delivered to the designed party(ies)**

As follows: I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on the same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

☒ (State) I declare under penalty of perjury the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

☐ (Federal) I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made

Executed on April 25, 2024 at Los Angeles, California.



Jessica Le