

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

David D. Bibiyan (Cal. Bar No. 287811)

david@tomorrowlaw.com

Jeffrey D. Klein (Cal. Bar. No. 297296)

jeff@tomorrowlaw.com

Zachary T. Chrzan (Cal. Bar No. 329159)

zach@tomorrowlaw.com

Calyn V. Hadlock (Cal. Bar No. 352401)

calyn@tomorrowlaw.com

1460 Westwood Boulevard

Los Angeles, California 90024

Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

Attorneys for Plaintiff, THELMA HERRERA CORDOVA,

as an aggrieved employee, and on behalf of all other

aggrieved employees

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

THELMA HERRERA CORDOVA, as an
aggrieved employee, and on behalf of all other
aggrieved employees under the Labor Code
Private Attorneys' General Act of 2004,

Plaintiff,

v.

CEVA INTERNATIONAL INC., a Delaware
stock corporation; CEVA CONTRACT
LOGISTICS U.S., INC., a Delaware stock
corporation; CEVA FREIGHT, LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company; and
DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: **24STCV17517**

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

[Amount in Controversy Greater Than
\$35,000.00]

1 Plaintiff Thelma Herrera Cordova, as an aggrieved employee, brings this Action under the
2 Labor Code Private Attorneys' General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") to collect civil penalties under
3 PAGA for all other aggrieved employees, and, in doing so, alleges as follows:

4 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5 1. This is a representative action, pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General
6 Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA"), against Ceva International,
7 Inc., and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California
8 ("Ceva International"); Ceva Contract Logistics U.S. and any of its respective subsidiaries or
9 affiliated companies within the State of California ("Ceva Contract"); Ceva Freight, LLC and any
10 of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("Ceva Freight"
11 and collectively, with Ceva International, Ceva Contract, and DOES 1 through 100, as further
12 defined below, "Defendants"), as a proxy of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the
13 State of California ("LWDA"), on behalf of all other current and former non-exempt employees of
14 Defendants working within the Civil Penalty Period, as further defined herein, and, as it pertains to
15 the alleged claims for failure to comply with Labor Code sections 96, 98.6, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204,
16 210, 226, 226.3, 227.3, 232, 232.5, 245, 246, 432, 432.3, 432.5, 432.7, 432.8, 1102.5, 1197.5,
17 1198.5, 1527, 3366, 3457, and 8397.4, on behalf of all employees of Defendants working within the
18 Civil Penalty Period (collectively, "Aggrieved Employees").

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

21 3. Venue is proper in Los Angeles County, California pursuant to Code of Civil
22 Procedure sections 392, *et seq.* because, among other things, Los Angeles County is where the
23 causes of action complained of herein arose; the county in which the employment relationship
24 began; the county in which performance of the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff
25 and Defendants was due to be performed; and the county in which the employment contract, or part
26 of it, between Plaintiff and Defendants was actually performed. Moreover, the unlawful acts alleged
27 herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees in Los Angeles County, and
28 because Defendants employ numerous Aggrieved Employees in Los Angeles County.

1 4. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” under PAGA, as Plaintiff was employed by
2 Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code
3 violations set forth herein. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties, as the term “civil
4 penalty” is defined under *ZB N.A. v. Superior Court* (2019) 8 Cal.5th 175, under the Labor Code
5 Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) plus
6 reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, for all other aggrieved current and former employees of
7 Defendants during the Civil Penalty Period. Plaintiff does not seek to assert his own claim for civil
8 penalties under PAGA as part of this Action.

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

13 6. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding the provision of notice to the
14 LWDA regarding the herein-described Labor Code violations (the “Civil Penalty Period”),
15 Defendants violated, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 96, 98.6, 200, 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210,
16 212, 213, 221, 223, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 232, 232.5, 245, 246, 404, 432, 432.3, 432.5, 432.7,
17 432.8, 510, 512, 558, 1102.5, 1174, 1174.5, 11821.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.5, 1198.5, 1527,
18 2699, 2802, 2810.5, 3366, 3457, and 8397.4, among others, California Code of Regulations, Title
19 8, Section 3395, Business and Professions Code sections 16600, 16700, and 17200, Government
20 Code section 12952, as well as applicable Wage Orders.

21 7. Labor Code section 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g), authorizes aggrieved employees
22 on behalf of all other aggrieved current and former employees within the statutory period, to bring
23 a civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section
24 2699.3 without asserting a claim to bring Plaintiff’s own claim for civil penalties under PAGA.
25 (*See, e.g., Balderas v. Fresh Start Harvesting, Inc.* (2024) 101 Cal.App.5th 533.) Specifically,
26 Plaintiff does not seek to recover Plaintiff’s 25% share of civil penalties for the particular Labor
27 Code violations Plaintiff experienced. Rather, this is a purely representative PAGA action wherein
28 Plaintiff seeks to recover all civil penalties for the Labor Code violations experienced by third-party

1 aggrieved employees (Aggrieved Employees) and the State of California's 75% of the civil penalties
2 for the Labor Code violations Plaintiff experienced.

3 8. On or around March 26, 2024, Plaintiff provided written notice pursuant to Labor
4 Code section 2699.3 online and by certified mail, with return receipt requested, of Defendants'
5 violation of various, including the herein-described, provisions of the Labor Code, to the LWDA,
6 as well as by certified mail, with return receipt requested to Defendants, and each of them.

7 9. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a)(2)(A), the LWDA did not
8 provide notice of its intention to investigate Defendants' alleged violations within sixty-five (65)
9 calendar days of the March 26, 2024 postmarked date of the herein-described notice sent by Plaintiff
10 to the LWDA and Defendants.

11 **PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ALLEGATIONS**

12 10. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
13 of failing to pay overtime wages to Aggrieved Employees in the State of California in violation of
14 California state wage and hour laws as a result of, without limitation, Aggrieved Employees working
15 over eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a
16 workweek without paying them proper overtime wages, as a result of, without limitation, failing to
17 accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting
18 employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees: to remain
19 on-call, to suffer under Defendants' control to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-
20 shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue working, to don and doff
21 uniforms off the clock, to attend company meetings off the clock, to make phone calls off the clock;
22 failing to include all forms of remuneration, including non-discretionary bonuses, incentive pay,
23 meal allowances, and other forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the pay periods
24 where overtime was worked and the additional compensation was earned for the purpose of
25 calculating the overtime rate of pay; detrimental rounding of employee time entries, editing and/or
26 manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked, for paying straight pay instead
27 of overtime pay, and by attempting but failing to properly implement an alternative workweek
28 schedule ("AWS") (including, without limitation, by failing to implement a written agreement

1 designating the regularly scheduled alternative workweek in which the specified number of work
2 days and work hours are regularly recurring; failing to adopt the AWS in a secret ballot election,
3 before the performance of work, by at least a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the affected employees in the
4 work unit; failing to follow the notice/disclosures procedures prior to any AWS election; and/or
5 failing to register an AWS election with the State of California, as required by Labor Code section
6 511 and applicable Wage Orders), to the detriment of Aggrieved Employees.

7 11. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a practice or policy
8 of failing to compensate Aggrieved Employees with minimum wages for all hours Aggrieved
9 Employees worked or were otherwise under Defendants' control as a result of, without limitation,
10 failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; by requiring Aggrieved
11 Employees: to remain on-call; to suffer under Defendants' control to complete pre-shift tasks before
12 clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue
13 working, to don and doff uniforms off the clock, to attend company meetings off the clock, and to
14 make phone calls off the clock; detrimental rounding of employee time entries, editing and/or
15 manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked; failing to pay reporting time
16 pay; failing to pay paid time off and vacation time owed; and failing to pay split shift premiums, to
17 the detriment of Aggrieved Employees.

18 12. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
19 of failing to provide Aggrieved Employees a thirty (30) minute uninterrupted, timely, and complete
20 meal period for days on which the employee worked in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per day
21 without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or
22 compensation in lieu thereof including, without limitation, by interrupting meal periods; not
23 providing timely meal periods; failing to provide first and second meal periods; providing short
24 meal periods; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during meal
25 periods; not permitting employees to leave the premises; otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call meal
26 periods; and auto-deducting meal periods that could not be auto-deducted by law or during which
27 employees worked, as required by California wage and hour laws.

1 13. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
2 of failing to provide Aggrieved Employees paid, uninterrupted, timely, and complete rest periods of
3 at least ten (10) minutes per four (4) hours worked or major fractions thereof, or compensation in
4 lieu thereof, including, without limitation, by failing to provide rest periods all together; requiring
5 that they be bundled together and/or with meal periods; interrupting them; requiring that employees
6 carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during rest periods; not providing them in a timely
7 fashion; and not permitting employees to leave the premises; and otherwise requiring on-duty/on-
8 call rest periods, as required by California wage and hour laws.

9 14. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing
10 to permit Aggrieved Employees from taking cooldown rest periods as required under California
11 Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 3395, and have failed to pay premium pay in lieu thereof under
12 Labor Code section 226.7.

13 15. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing
14 to pay premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 to Aggrieved Employees for non-
15 compliant meal periods and rest periods, as well as the failure to provide cooldown periods, at the
16 proper regular rate of pay in violation of Labor Code sections 512, 226.7, and applicable wage
17 orders.

18 16. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice of
19 issuing payment of wages due, or to become due, or as an advance on wages to be earned: (1) an
20 order, check, draft, note, memorandum, gift card, or other acknowledgment of indebtedness, which
21 was not negotiable and payable in cash, on demand, without discount, at some established place of
22 business in the state; and/or upon which the name and address did not appear on the instrument;
23 and/or at the time of its issuance and for a reasonable time thereafter, which must be at least 30 days,
24 the maker or drawer did not have sufficient funds in, or credit, arrangement, or understanding with
25 the drawee for its payment and/or (2) any scrip, coupon, or other thing redeemable, in merchandise,
26 or purporting to be payable or redeemable otherwise than in money. Plaintiff is further informed
27 and believes, and based thereon alleges that such wages were not compensated at the “regular rate”
28 of compensation as provided under Labor Code sections 226.7 and 510, subsection (a).

1 17. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
2 of failing to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), by intentionally failing to furnish
3 Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross wages earned;
4 total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; all deductions; all applicable hourly rates in
5 effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by
6 the employee; the legal name of the employer and/or the name and address of the legal entity
7 securing the employer's services if the employer is a farm labor contractor; and other such
8 information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

9 18. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
10 of failing to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), by intentionally failing to furnish
11 Aggrieved Employees with documents signed to obtain or hold employment under Labor Code
12 section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records under Labor
13 Code section 1174, making it difficult for Aggrieved Employees to calculate their unpaid wages
14 and/or premium payments, to the detriment of Aggrieved Employees.

15 19. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
16 of failing to timely pay Aggrieved Employees, among other wages, all wages owed as a result of
17 Defendants' practice or policy of failing to pay, among other wages, overtime wages at the regular
18 rate of pay, minimum wages, premium wages at the regular rate of pay, paid time off, paid sick
19 leave, and vacation time owed as required by Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

20 20. At all relevant times herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing
21 to pay Aggrieved Employees their paid time off and vacation time owed upon separation of
22 employment as wages at their final rate of pay in violation of Labor Code section 227.3 and
23 applicable Wage Orders.

24 21. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
25 failing and refusing, and continue to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without
26 limitation, Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for driving personal vehicles (*i.e.*,
27 mileage and gas), purchasing uniforms, including, without limitation, for steel-toe boots, non-slip
28 shoes, and other safety and/or personal protective equipment ("PPE"), providing uniform and other

1 deposits, separately laundering mandatory uniforms, for the purchase of tools, and for the purchase
2 and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans, in direct consequence of the discharge
3 of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of Defendants, as required by Labor Code
4 2802.

5 22. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
6 failing to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft
7 Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to provide Aggrieved Employees with the
8 rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment; allowances claimed as part
9 of the minimum wage; the regular payday designated by Defendants; the name, address, and
10 telephone number of the workers' compensation insurance carrier; information regarding paid sick
11 leave; and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Defendants under Labor Code
12 section 2810.5.

13 23. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved
14 Employees with the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to California law
15 (including, without limitation Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*), and also did not permit its use upon
16 request as contemplated under California laws, to the detriment of Aggrieved Employees.

17 24. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had or have a policy or practice
18 of failing to reimburse deposits made, including uniform deposits, together with all interest owed at
19 the separation of employment in violation of Labor Code section 404.

20 25. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
21 failing to pay Aggrieved Employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code Section 204, which
22 requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month
23 shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed,
24 and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any calendar month, shall be
25 paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month."

26 26. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants have had, and continue to have, a policy
27 of failing to provide all working employees with suitable seats when the nature of the work
28 reasonably permits the use of seats. Defendants have also failed to place an adequate number of

1 seats in reasonable proximity to the work area and/or permitted employees to use such seats when
2 it does not interfere with the performance of their duties and employees are not engaged in the active
3 duties of their employment, and the nature of their work requires standing.

4 27. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants have had, and continue to have, a policy
5 of failing to provide all temporary workers with owed wages weekly by not later than the regular
6 payday of the following week.

7 28. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants have had, and continue to have, a policy
8 of failing to provide adequate and readily accessible sanitation facilities; a regular schedule for
9 servicing, cleaning, and supplying each facility to ensure it is maintained in a clean, sanitary and
10 serviceable condition; an adequate supply of suitable cleansing agents, water, single-use towels or
11 blowers; and a sufficient number of toilets to be used by each sex of employee.

12 29. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants have had, and continue to have, a policy
13 of conducting unlawful background checks on prospective and current employees prior to making
14 a conditional offer. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
15 violated applicable laws by, without limitation: requiring job applicants and employees to disclose
16 their conviction history before Defendants made a conditional offer of employment; inquiring into
17 or considering the conviction history of applicants before Defendants made any conditional offers
18 of employment; considering, distributing, or disseminating information about arrests not followed
19 by conviction, referrals to or participation in a pretrial or posttrial diversion program, convictions
20 that have been sealed, dismissed, expunged, or statutorily eradicated pursuant to law, or any
21 conviction for which the convicted person has received a full pardon or has been issued a certificate
22 of rehabilitation, while conducting conviction history background checks in connection with any
23 applications for employment; intending to deny an applicant a position of employment solely or in
24 part because of the applicant's conviction history; and asking applicants for employment to disclose,
25 through any written form or verbally, information concerning or related to an arrest, detention,
26 processing, diversion, supervision, adjudication, or court disposition that occurred while the person
27 was subject to the process and jurisdiction of the juvenile court, to the detriment of Aggrieved
28 Employees.

1 30. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants have had, and continue to have, a practice
2 or policy of relying on the salary history information of an applicant for employment as a factor in
3 determining whether to offer employment to an applicant or what salary to offer the applicant in
4 violation of Labor Code section 432.3 by including, on Defendants' application for employment, an
5 inquiry regarding current and/or former salary history information, including, without limitation,
6 compensation and benefits of the applicant for employment.

7 31. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants have had, and continue to have, a practice
8 or policy of requiring Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to confidentiality policies that
9 unlawfully restrain trade by prohibiting Aggrieved Employees from speaking with prospective
10 employers about their work with Defendants, including, but not limited to, their wages and working
11 conditions. Defendants also required Aggrieved Employees to inform prospective employers of
12 Defendants' restrictions of Aggrieved Employees' freedom to work.

13 32. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
14 of preventing Aggrieved Employees from using or disclosing the skills, knowledge and experience
15 they obtained at Defendants' business for purposes of competing with Defendants, including,
16 without limitation, preventing Aggrieved Employees from disclosing their wages in negotiating a
17 new job with a prospective employer and from disclosing who else works at Defendants and under
18 what circumstances that they might be receptive to an offer from a rival employer. Plaintiff is
19 informed and believes that this policy and/or practice violates Business and Professions Code
20 sections 17200, 16600 and 16700, and, by virtue thereof, various provisions of the Labor Code,
21 including Labor Code sections 232, 232.5, and 1197.5, subdivision (k).

22 33. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of preventing Aggrieved Employees
23 from disclosing violations of state and federal law, either within Defendants to their managers or
24 outside to private attorneys or government officials, among others, in violation of Business and
25 Professions Code section 17200, and, thus, in violation of Labor Code section 1102.5. In addition,
26 Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' herein-described policies and/or practices
27 prevent Aggrieved Employees from disclosing information about unsafe or discriminatory working
28 conditions or about wage and hour violations in violation of Labor Code section 232 and 232.5.

34. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of preventing Aggrieved Employees from engaging in lawful conduct during non-work hours, thus violating state statutes entitling employees to disclose wages, working conditions, and illegal conduct, including, without limitation, Labor Code sections 96, subdivision (k), 98.6, 232, 232.5, and 1197.5, subdivision (k). Plaintiff is informed and believes that this lawful conduct includes the exercise of Aggrieved Employee's constitutional rights of freedom of speech and economic liberty.

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

PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

36. Plaintiff is a resident of the State of California. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee, with duties that included, but were not limited to, data entry and document review. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Plaintiff Thelma Herrera Cordova worked for Defendants from approximately September of 2012 through approximately May of 2023.

B. Defendants

37. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant Ceva International is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

38. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant Ceva Contract is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

39. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant Ceva

1 Freight is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing
2 under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County of Los
3 Angeles, State of California.

4 40. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise,
5 of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff,
6 who therefore sues defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474.
7 Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the defendants designated
8 herein as DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein.
9 Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of
10 the defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known. Plaintiff is
11 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each defendant acted in all respects pertinent
12 to this action, as the agent of the other defendant(s), carried out a joint scheme, business plan or
13 policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally attributable to the
14 other defendants. Whenever, heretofore or hereinafter, reference is made to “Defendants,” it shall
15 include Ceva International, Ceva Contract, Ceva Freight, and any of their parent, subsidiary, or
16 affiliated companies within the State of California, as well as DOES 1 through 100 identified herein.

17 **JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS**

18 41. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
19 mentioned herein, each of the defendants was the agent, principal, employee, employer,
20 representative, joint venture or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, either actually or
21 ostensibly, and in doing the things alleged herein acted within the course and scope of such agency,
22 employment, joint venture, and conspiracy.

23 42. All of the acts and conduct described herein of each and every corporate defendant
24 was duly authorized, ordered, and directed by the respective and collective defendant corporate
25 employers, and the officers and management-level employees of said corporate employers. In
26 addition thereto, said corporate employers participated in the aforementioned acts and conduct of
27 their said employees, agents, and representatives, and each of them; and upon completion of the
28 aforesaid acts and conduct of said corporate employees, agents, and representatives, the defendant

1 corporation respectively and collectively ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded,
2 acquiesced, authorized, and otherwise approved of each and all of the said acts and conduct of the
3 aforementioned corporate employees, agents and representatives.

4 43. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that despite the
5 formation of the purported corporate existence of Ceva International, Ceva Contract, Ceva Freight,
6 and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive (the “Alter Ego Defendants”), they, and each of them, are one
7 and the same with DOES 51 through 100 (“Individual Defendants”), and each of them, due to, but
8 not limited to, the following reasons:

9 a. The Alter Ego Defendants are completely dominated and controlled by the
10 Individual Defendants who personally committed the wrongful and illegal acts and violated the laws
11 as set forth in this Complaint, and who have hidden and currently hide behind the Alter Ego
12 Defendants to perpetrate frauds, circumvent statutes, or accomplish some other wrongful or
13 inequitable purpose;

14 b. The Individual Defendants derive actual and significant monetary benefits by
15 and through the Alter Ego Defendants’ unlawful conduct, and by using the Alter Ego Defendants as
16 the funding source for the Individual Defendants’ own personal expenditures;

17 c. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that the Individual
18 Defendants and the Alter Ego Defendants, while really one and the same, were segregated to appear
19 as though separate and distinct for purposes of perpetrating a fraud, circumventing a statute, or
20 accomplishing some other wrongful or inequitable purpose;

21 d. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that the business affairs
22 of the Individual Defendants and the Alter Ego Defendants are, and at all relevant times mentioned
23 herein were, so mixed and intermingled that the same cannot reasonably be segregated, and the same
24 are inextricable confusion. The Alter Ego Defendants are, and at all relevant times mentioned herein
25 were, used by the Individual Defendants as mere shells and conduits for the conduct of certain of
26 their, and each of their affairs. The Alter Ego Defendants are, and at all relevant times mentioned
27 herein were, the alter egos of the Individual Defendants;

28 e. The recognition of the separate existence of the Individual Defendants from

1 the Alter Ego Defendants would promote injustice insofar that it would permit these defendants to
2 insulate themselves from liability to Plaintiff for violations to the Civil Code, Government Code,
3 and other statutory violations. The corporate existence of these defendants should thus be
4 disregarded in equity and for the ends of justice because such disregard is necessary to avoid fraud
5 and injustice to Plaintiff herein;

6 f. Accordingly, the Alter Ego Defendants constitute the alter ego of the
7 Individual Defendants (and vice versa), and the fiction of their separate corporate existence must be
8 disregarded.

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

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

15 **Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 210**

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

21 47. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a), states and
22 stated that “[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in
23 this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3,
24 204, 204b, 204.1, 205, 205.5, and 1197.5, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any
25 initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee” and “(2) For
26 each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for
27 each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.”

28 48. At all relevant times herein, Defendants have had a consistent policy or practice of

1 failing to pay Aggrieved Employees during their employment on a timely basis as per Labor Code
2 section 204. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 210, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
3 recover civil penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code section 204, in the amount of one
4 hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation per employee, and
5 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation in
6 connection with each payment that was made in violation of Labor Code section 204.

7 49. Plaintiff does not seek to recover Plaintiff's 25% share of civil penalties for the
8 particular Labor Code violation(s) that Plaintiff experienced.

9 Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 226.3

10 50. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing to comply with Labor Code
11 section 226, subdivision (a), by intentionally failing to furnish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees
12 with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total hours worked; net
13 wages earned; the name and address of each employer with whom they have been placed to work;
14 all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
15 worked at each hourly rate; the legal name of the employer and/or the name and address of the legal
16 entity securing the employer's services if the employer is a farm labor contractor; and other such
17 information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

18 51. Labor Code section 226.3 states that "[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a)
19 of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250)
20 per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for
21 each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage
22 deduction statement or fails to keep the records required in subdivision (a) of Section 226."

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

25 53. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had
26 and have a policy or practice of failing to furnish Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage
27 statements that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total hours worked; net wages earned; all
28 deductions; all applicable hourly rates in effect and the corresponding number of hours worked at

1 each hourly rate in effect during the pay period; the legal name of the employer and/or the name and
2 address of the legal entity securing the employer's services if the employer is a farm labor contractor;
3 and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

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

9 55. Plaintiff does not seek to recover Plaintiff's 25% share of civil penalties for the
10 particular Labor Code violation(s) that Plaintiff experienced.

11 Violation of Labor Code § 558

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

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

19 (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid
20 employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to
21 an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages;

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

23 57. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants, and
24 each of them, violated, or caused to be violated, the Labor Code sections described herein, including
25 failing to provide written notice in the language Defendant normally uses to communicate
26 employment-related information to the employee, containing the following information: pay the
27 rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment; allowances claimed as part
28 of the minimum wage; the regular payday designated by Defendants; Defendants' name(s),

1 including “doing business as” names used; the name, address, and telephone number of the workers’
2 compensation insurance carrier; information regarding paid sick leave; and other pertinent
3 information required to be disclosed by Defendants.

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

9 59. Plaintiff does not seek to recover Plaintiff’s 25% share of civil penalties for the
10 particular Labor Code violation(s) that Plaintiff experienced.

11 Violation of Labor Code § 1174.5

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

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

22 62. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d) has required
23 every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep, at a central location in the state or at the
24 plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours
25 worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and applicable
26 piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records
27 shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any
28 case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee

1 from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units
2 earned.”

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

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

13 65. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
14 pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties
15 for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of five hundred dollars
16 (\$500) per violation per Aggrieved Employee.

17 66. Plaintiff does not seek to recover Plaintiff’s 25% share of civil penalties for the
18 particular Labor Code violation(s) that Plaintiff experienced.

19 Violation of Labor Code § 1197.1

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

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

1 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
2 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

3 (2) For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty
4 dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
5 employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is
6 intentionally committed. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
7 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
8 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

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

12 68. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants caused
13 Aggrieved Employees not to be paid minimum wages as a result of Defendants, without limitation,
14 routinely failing to pay Aggrieved Employees’ minimum wages for all hours Aggrieved Employees
15 worked or were otherwise under Defendants’ control due to, without limitation, routinely failing to
16 accurately track and/or pay for all hours actually worked; detrimental rounding or manipulation of
17 time entries; paying straight pay instead of overtime or otherwise failing to pay overtime hours at
18 the proper overtime rate of pay; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock,
19 entitling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to actual and liquidated damages.

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

25 70. Plaintiff does not seek to recover Plaintiff’s 25% share of civil penalties for the
26 particular Labor Code violation(s) that Plaintiff experienced.

27 Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 2699

28 71. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), notwithstanding any other

1 provision of law, any provision of the Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed
2 and collected by the LWDA or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or
3 employees for a violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil
4 action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former
5 employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

6 72. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f), for all provisions of the Labor
7 Code except those for which a civil penalty is specifically provided, the established civil penalty for
8 a violation of those provisions is as follows: if, at the time of the alleged violation, the person
9 employs one or more employees, the civil penalty is one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved
10 employee per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved
11 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

12 73. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and
13 each of them, violated the Labor Code sections described herein, including, without limitation, for
14 the failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with the amount of paid sick leave required to be
15 provided pursuant to California and local laws and provide written notice in the language Defendant
16 normally uses to communicate employment-related information to the employee, containing the
17 following information: pay the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their
18 employment; allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage; the regular payday designated by
19 Defendants; Defendants' name(s), including "doing business as" names used; the name, address,
20 and telephone number of the workers' compensation insurance carrier; information regarding paid
21 sick leave; and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Defendants under Labor Code
22 section 2810.5.

23 74. Moreover, Aggrieved Employees within the State of California are entitled to an
24 award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with their herein-described claims for
25 civil penalties.

26 75. Plaintiff does not seek to recover Plaintiff's 25% share of civil penalties for the
27 particular Labor Code violation(s) that Plaintiff experienced.

28 **PRAYER**

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

- 3 A. An award of civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558,
4 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699 for all Aggrieved Employees aside from Plaintiff;
5 B. An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections
6 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
7 C. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;
8 D. For costs of suit incurred herein; and
9 E. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

10 Dated: July 15, 2024

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

11
12 BY: /s/ Calyn V. Hadlock

13 DAVID D. BIBIYAN
14 JEFFREY D. KLEIN
15 ZACHARY T. CHRZAN
16 CALYN V. HADLOCK

17 Attorneys for Plaintiff THELMA HERRERA
18 CORDOVA, as an aggrieved employee on
19 behalf of all other aggrieved employees under
20 the Labor Code Private Attorneys' General
21 Act of 2004
22
23
24
25
26
27
28