

Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
H. Scott Leviant (SBN 200834)
Sandy Pham (SBN 352753)
MOON LAW GROUP, PC
725 S. Figueroa St., 31st Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 232-3128
Facsimile: (213) 232-3125
E-mail: kmoon@moonlawgroup.com
E-mail: hsleviant@moonlawgroup.com
E-mail: spham@moonlawgroup.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff, Tranekia Richards

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

TRANEKIA RICHARDS, individually, and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LAKEVIEW TERRACE SKILLED NURSING
FACILITY, LLC, a limited liability company;
SOUTH PASADENA CARE CENTER, LLC, a
limited liability company, ELLIOT ZEMEL,
individually, and DOES 4 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 24STCV06732

*[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon.
William F. Highberger, Dept. 10]*

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

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197];
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Compensation [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198];
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512];
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Breaks [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7];
5. Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses [Cal. Lab. Code § 2802];
6. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203];
7. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements [Cal. Lab. Code § 226];
8. Unfair Business Practices [Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*];
9. Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab. Code § 2699, *et seq.*]; and
10. Failure to Follow Wage and Hour Laws [Cal. Lab. Code § 558.1].

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.....	1
THE PARTIES	3
A. Plaintiff.....	3
B. Defendants.....	3
ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION	5
CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS	9
FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION.....	13
SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION.....	14
THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION	15
FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	16
FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	17
SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	17
SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	19
EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	20
NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION	23
TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	25
PRAYER FOR RELIEF.....	26
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	30

1 Plaintiff Tranekia Richards (“Plaintiff”), based upon facts that either have evidentiary
2 support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further
3 investigation and discovery, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendant Lakeview Terrace Skilled Nursing
6 Facility, LLC (“Defendant Lakeview”), Defendant South Pasadena Care Center, LLC (“Defendant
7 South Pasadena”), Defendant Elliot Zemel (“Defendant Zemel”), and Does 4 through 10
8 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor Code violations and unfair business
9 practices stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime
10 wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to
11 maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failure to timely pay all wages to
12 terminated employees, failure to indemnify necessary business expenses, and failure to furnish
13 accurate wage statements.

14 2. Plaintiff brings the First through Eighth Causes of Action individually and as a class
15 action on behalf of herself and certain current and former employees of Defendants (hereinafter
16 collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members” and defined more fully below). The
17 Class consists of Plaintiff and all other persons who have been employed by any Defendants in
18 California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee during the statute of limitations period
19 applicable to the claims pleaded here.

20 3. Plaintiff brings the Ninth Cause of Action as a representative action under the
21 California Private Attorney General Act (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties that are owed to
22 Plaintiff, the State of California, and all other current and former aggrieved employees who worked
23 for Defendants in California as an hourly paid, non-exempt employee at any time within the
24 applicable statutory period (hereinafter referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”).

25 4. Plaintiff brings the Tenth Cause of Action on behalf of herself and the Class against
26 Defendant Zemel for Defendant Zemel’s failure to comply with wage and hour laws on behalf of
27 Defendant Lakeview.

28 //

1 5. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
2 establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. As such, and based
3 upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants are
4 subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission
5 ("IWC"), and the California Business & Professions Code.

6 6. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period Defendants maintained
7 a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 8 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum
9 wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code
10 and IWC Wage Orders;
- 11 (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in
12 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing
13 to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and failing
14 to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period violation
15 occurred;
- 16 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
17 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
18 Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a rest
19 period violation occurred;
- 20 (d) Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred;
- 21 (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, overtime wages,
22 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages due within the
23 time period specified by California law when employment terminates; and
- 24 (f) Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked.
- 25 (g) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements
26 containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and
27 IWC Wage Orders.

28 //

7. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their unlawful policies. Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were willful and deliberate.

8. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of “respondeat superior”.

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

9. Plaintiff is a California resident that worked for Defendant Lakeview, allegedly affiliated with Defendant South Pasadena and Defendant Zemel, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, as a nurse assistant in Los Angeles County during the statutory period.

10. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v. American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

B. Defendants

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendant Lakeview and Defendant South Pasadena are:

- (a) Business entities with their principal places of business in Los Angeles, California;
- (b) Business entities conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Los Angeles County; and
- (c) The former employers of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employers of the putative Class. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

1 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
2 alleges, that Defendant Zemel:

- 3 (a) is an individual residing in California;
- 4 (b) conducts business within Los Angeles County;
- 5 (c) controls and dominates Defendant Lakeview and Defendant South Pasadena;
- 6 (d) acts on behalf of Defendant Lakeview and Defendant South Pasadena; and
- 7 (e) failed to comply with wage and hour laws.

8 13. On information and belief, Defendant Zemel controlled and dominated Defendant
9 Lakeview, comingling assets and operating Defendant Lakeview as one of several alter egos
10 Defendant Zemel utilizes to avoid liability for his wage and hour violations, disregarding legal
11 formalities, and inadequately capitalizing both Defendant Lakeview and Defendant South
12 Pasadena. Defendant Zemel is allegedly using both Defendant Lakeview and Defendant South
13 Pasadena as mere shells, manipulating assets and liabilities of Defendant Lakeview and Defendant
14 South Pasadena so as to deplete assets of Defendant Lakeview and Defendant South Pasadena,
15 using Defendant Lakeview and Defendant South Pasadena to conceal his individual business
16 activities, and using Defendant Lakeview and Defendant South Pasadena to avoid personal
17 obligations.

18 14. Plaintiff does not currently know the true names or capacities of the persons or
19 entities sued herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious
20 names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages
21 suffered by Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiff will
22 amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they
23 have been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

24 15. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and
25 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or
26 injured a significant number of the Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in the State
27 of California.

28 //

1 Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and the
2 other employees described in the class definitions below, and exercised control over their wages,
3 hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all
4 relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director,
5 controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or
6 predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all
7 of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some
8 or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged
9 below. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted pursuant
10 to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should
11 have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the
12 conduct of all other Defendants.

13 **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

14 17. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of Los
15 Angeles, State of California, as a nurse assistant during the statutory period. During the statutory
16 period, Defendants classified Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee, and paid Plaintiff and hourly
17 wage.

18 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours
19 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with
20 uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take uninterrupted rest
21 periods, failed to indemnify Plaintiff for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all final
22 wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment, and failed to furnish
23 accurate wage statements to Plaintiff. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for
24 Defendants was typical and illustrative.

25 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not
26 paying Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all
27 overtime wages. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work off the
28 clock, and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were

1 required to wait in line in order to clock into work, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, during
2 certain times, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo
3 temperature checks prior to clocking into work, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiff,
4 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo COVID and temperature checks
5 prior to clocking into work, including waiting in line, off the clock and uncompensated. Also,
6 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes required to wait until the
7 following shift employees arrived prior to leaving, off the clock and uncompensated. Also during
8 the statutory period, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes required
9 to return home soon after arriving at work, without being paid reporting time pay.

10 20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to provide
11 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods.
12 Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
13 to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing 30-minute, continuous and
14 uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating
15 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the
16 end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not adequately inform
17 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of
18 the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work.
19 Defendants also failed to accurately record meal periods. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and
20 practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in
21 compliance with California law.

22 21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
23 and permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest
24 periods. Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
25 Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and
26 permitting them to take a 10-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours
27 of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff, the Class, and the
28 Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendants also did

1 not adequately inform Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a
2 rest period. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or
3 authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendants
4 have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendants also did not
5 have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
6 Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendants did not maintain accurate
7 records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendants cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff, the
8 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period.
9 Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiff, the Class,
10 and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

11 22. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff, the
12 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their
13 duties for Defendants without reimbursement, such as the purchase of masks and specific types of
14 scrubs. Also, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were occasionally required to use
15 their own personal cellular telephones for work purposes, without reimbursement.

16 23. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
17 pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at the conclusion of their employment all
18 wages for all minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period
19 premium wages.

20 24. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff, the Class,
21 and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable
22 hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages
23 earned for hours worked, correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were
24 not provided in accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not
25 authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and Defendant's address).
26 Further, the wage statements do not show Defendant's address as required by California law. As
27 a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiff, the Class, and the
28 Aggrieved Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

- (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages to which they were entitled, even though they were entitled;
- (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even though they had not been;
- (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they were;
- (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they had not been;
- (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage statements contained the required accurate information;
- (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;
- (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages rates to which Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled, and Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

//

Thus, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code § 226(e), including actual damages.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

25. Plaintiff brings certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all other persons similarly situated, and thus, seek class certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

26. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief authorized by California law.

27. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

All persons who worked for any Defendants in California as an hourly, non-exempt employee at any time during the period beginning four years before the filing of the initial complaint in this action and ending when notice to the Class is sent.

28. At all material times, Plaintiff was a member of the Class.

29. Plaintiff undertakes this concerted activity to improve the wages and working conditions of all Class Members.

30. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is readily ascertainable:

(a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical. The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time, however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' records.

(b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.

//

1 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect
2 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-
3 defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated
4 herein. Plaintiff has no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class
5 Member. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the
6 rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement.
7 Plaintiff has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will
8 continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be
9 necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial
10 benefit of each class member.

11 (d) Superiority: A Class Action is superior to other available methods for the fair
12 and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

- 13 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling
14 the prosecution or defense of separate actions;
- 15 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy
16 already commenced by or against members of the Class;
- 17 3) The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the
18 claims in the particular forum; and
- 19 4) The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class
20 action.

21 (e) Public Policy Considerations: The public policy of the State of California is
22 to resolve the California Labor Code claims of many employees through a
23 class action. Indeed, current employees are often afraid to assert their rights
24 out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are also fearful
25 of bringing actions because they believe their former employers might
26 damage their future endeavors through negative references and/or other
27 means. Class actions provide the class members who are not named in the
28 complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their
rights at the same time as their privacy is protected.

1 31. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class (and each subclass, if
2 any) that predominate over questions affecting only individual members, including without
3 limitation, whether, as alleged herein, Defendants have:

- 4 (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum
5 wages, and overtime wages;
- 6 (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class
7 Members;
- 8 (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium
9 wages to Class Members;
- 10 (d) Failed to promptly pay all wages due to Class Members upon their discharge
11 or resignation;
- 12 (e) Failed to maintain accurate records of all hours Class Members worked, and
13 all meal periods Class Members took or missed;
- 14 (f) Failed to reimburse Class Members for all necessary business expenses; and
- 15 (g) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et. seq.* as a
16 result of their illegal conduct as described above.

17 32. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to
18 California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because:

- 19 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any
20 question affecting only individual members;
- 21 (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
22 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- 23 (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all
24 members of the class before the Court;
- 25 (d) Plaintiff, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain
26 effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a
27 class action;

28 //

- 1 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable
2 relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate compensation
3 for the damages and injuries for which Defendants are responsible in an
4 amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the Class for
5 the injuries sustained;
- 6 (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual
7 members of the class would create a risk of:
- 8 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
9 members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards
10 of conduct for Defendants; and/or
- 11 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would,
12 as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members
13 not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially impair or
14 impede their ability to protect their interests, including but not
15 limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from those
16 parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,
- 17 (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
18 the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to
19 the class as a whole.

20 33. Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of
21 the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own
22 business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated
23 notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiff would contemplate the
24 use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as published notice,
25 e-mail notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by other methods suitable
26 to the Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

27 //

28 //

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Minimum Wages for All Hours Worked)**

3 34. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
4 1 through 22 in this First Amended Complaint.

5 35. “Hours worked” is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of
6 an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or
7 not required to do so.

8 36. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants knowingly failed to pay to
9 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees compensation for all hours they worked. By
10 their failure to pay compensation for each hour worked as alleged above, Defendants willfully
11 violated the provisions of Section 1194 of the California Labor Code, and any additional applicable
12 Wage Orders, which require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

13 37. Accordingly, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
14 recover minimum wages for all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

15 38. By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
16 Employees have been deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned by virtue of their
17 employment with Defendants.

18 39. By virtue of the Defendants’ unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to
19 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for their non-overtime hours worked without
20 pay, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees suffered, and will continue to suffer,
21 damages in amounts which are presently unknown to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
22 Employees, but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court, and which will be
23 ascertained according to proof at trial.

24 40. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code §
25 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage
26 compensation due Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

27 //

28 //

41. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover liquidated damages (double damages) for Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages.

42. California Labor Code section 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at rates required by law, including minimum wages. However, during all such times, Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all such wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month.

43. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to seek recovery of all unpaid minimum wages, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6, and 1194(a).

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)

44. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 22 in this First Amended Complaint.

45. California Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

46. California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, California Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

47. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have worked more than eight hours in a workday, as employees of Defendants.

//

//

1 48. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the
2 Aggrieved Employees overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the
3 maximum hours permissible by law as required by California Labor Code § 510 and 1198.
4 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are regularly required to work overtime hours.

5 49. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional premium rate
6 compensation to the Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for their overtime hours
7 worked, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered, and will continue to
8 suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to them but which exceed the
9 jurisdictional minimum of this Court and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

10 50. By failing to keep adequate time records required by Labor Code § 1174(d),
11 Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation due to
12 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

13 51. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees also request recovery of overtime
14 compensation according to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor
15 Code § 1194(a), as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in a sum
16 as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

17 52. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages
18 due and payable twice a month. The Wage Orders also provide that every employer shall pay to
19 each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime wages for all overtime
20 hours worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff, the Class, and the
21 Aggrieved Employees with all compensation due, in violation of California Labor Code § 204.

22 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)**

24 53. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
25 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

26 54. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the
27 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of all duty in order to take their first daily meal
28 periods no later than the start of Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees' sixth hour of

1 work in a workday, and to take their second meal periods no later than the start of the eleventh
2 hour of work in the workday. Section 512 of the California Labor Code, and Section 11 of the
3 applicable Wage Orders require that an employer provide unpaid meal periods of at least 30
4 minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a violation of Section 226.7 of the California Labor
5 Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any meal period mandated under
6 any Wage Order.

7 55. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiff,
8 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with both meal periods as required by California law. By
9 their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take all
10 meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or
11 impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods), Defendants willfully violated the
12 provisions of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code and the applicable Wage Orders.

13 56. Under California law, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled
14 to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all
15 required meal period(s), plus interest thereon.

16 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods)**

18 57. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
19 1 through 22 in this First Amended Complaint.

20 58. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10
21 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than
22 two hours). Section 512 of the California Labor Code, the applicable Wage Orders require that the
23 employer permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of 10 minutes each for each
24 4-hour period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes,
25 the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is
26 itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of Section 226.7 of the California
27 Labor Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest period mandated
28 under any Wage Order.

1 59. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiff, the Class,
2 and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked more
3 than 4 hours in a workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff, the Class, and the
4 Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made
5 it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully
6 violated the provisions of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code and the applicable Wage
7 Orders.

8 60. Under California law, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled
9 to be paid one hour of premium wages rate for each workday he or she was not provided with all
10 required rest break(s), plus interest thereon.

11 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses)**

13 61. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
14 1 through 22 in this First Amended Complaint.

15 62. Defendants violated Labor Code section 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, by failing
16 to pay and indemnify the Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for their necessary
17 expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their
18 obedience to directions of Defendants.

19 63. As a result, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were damaged at least
20 in the amounts of the expenses they paid, or which were deducted by Defendants from their wages.

21 64. Plaintiff, the class and aggrieved employees she represents are entitled to attorney's
22 fees, expenses, and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(c) and interest pursuant to
23 Labor Code section 2802(b).

24 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees – Waiting Time** 26 **Penalties)**

27 65. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
28 1 through 22 in this First Amended Complaint.

1 66. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if
2 an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due
3 and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or
4 her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless
5 the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in
6 which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

7 67. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many
8 other members of the Class ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the
9 employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and
10 continue to fail to pay terminated Class Members, without abatement, all wages required to be paid
11 by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-
12 two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

13 68. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and those Class members who are no longer
14 employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within seventy-
15 two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§
16 201 and 202.

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

21 70. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from
22 Defendants their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular
23 hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

24 71. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, Plaintiff, the Class,
25 and the Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest,
26 expenses, and costs incurred in this action.

27 //

28 //

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and**
3 **Compliant Wage Records)**

4 72. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
5 1 through 22 in this First Amended Complaint.

6 73. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that
7 every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in
8 writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours
9 worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate
10 if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made
11 on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned,
12 (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee
13 and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number
14 other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the
15 employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
16 number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

17 74. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with
18 complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure
19 to correctly identify the gross wages earned by Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees,
20 the failure to list the true “total hours worked by the employee,” and the failure to list the true net
21 wages earned.

22 75. As a result of Defendants’ violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff,
23 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-
24 protected rights.

25 76. Specifically, Plaintiff and the members of the Class have been injured by
26 Defendants’ intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied both
27 their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage
28 statements under California Labor Code § 226(a).

77. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees is difficult and time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were also injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt to obtain correct wage information following Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the mandates of California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

78. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendants their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a).

79. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to injunctive relief, as well as an award of attorney's fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h).

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)

80. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 22 in this First Amended Complaint.

81. Defendants, and each of them, are “persons” as defined under California Business & Professions Code § 17201.

82. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Class members, and to the general public. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

83. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

//

//

//

//

1 84. A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be
2 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as violations
3 of, among other things, the California Labor Code, are unlawful and in violation of public policy;
4 and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive, fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby
5 constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in violation of California Business
6 & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

7 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

8 85. Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages, and other benefits in violation of the
9 California Labor Code constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business
10 & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

11 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

12 86. Defendants' failure to pay overtime compensation and other benefits in violation of
13 California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity
14 prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

15 **Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of All Hours Worked**

16 87. Defendants' failure to maintain accurate records of all hours worked in accordance
17 with California Labor Code § 1174.5 and the IWC Wage Orders constitutes unlawful and/or unfair
18 activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

19 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

20 88. Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor
21 Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or
22 unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

23 **Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods**

24 89. Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with
25 California Labor Code § 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful
26 and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

27 //

28 //

1 **Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses**

2 90. Defendants' failure to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses in
3 accordance with California Labor Code § 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above,
4 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et*
5 *seq.*

6 **Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

7 91. Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements in accordance
8 with California Labor Code § 226, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity
9 prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

10 92. By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described
11 herein, the Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from Plaintiff, and all
12 persons similarly situated, and have deprived Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated, of valuable
13 rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

14 93. Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees suffered monetary
15 injury as a direct result of Defendants' wrongful conduct.

16 94. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, is entitled to,
17 and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property which the
18 Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
19 have been deprived, by means of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
20 practices. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are not obligated to establish individual
21 knowledge of the wrongful practices of Defendants in order to recover restitution.

22 95. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, are further
23 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair, unlawful
24 and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of them, from engaging
25 in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in the future.

26 96. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, have no plain,
27 speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members suffered
28 as a consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a

1 result of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiff,
2 individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, has suffered and will continue to
3 suffer irreparable harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to
4 engage in said unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

5 97. Plaintiff also alleges that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth
6 herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other
7 withholdings.

8 98. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiff and
9 putative Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by
10 Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a
11 permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and Class
12 Members; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and
13 other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

14 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act** 16 **of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 *et seq.*)**

17 99. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
18 1 through 22 in this First Amended Complaint.

19 100. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the
20 State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

21 101. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action
22 to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law,
23 any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor
24 and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
25 agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a
26 civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or
27 former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3."

28 //

1 102. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor
2 Code § 2699.3. On or around March 18, 2024, she gave written notice (“Notice”) by online filing
3 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to Defendant
4 Lakeview of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendant Lakeview violated against
5 Plaintiff and certain current and former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to
6 support the violations. On or around October 24, 2024, Plaintiff filed an amended Notice by online
7 filing to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants. Plaintiff also paid the filing fee.
8 Plaintiff’s PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-1017057-24. A true and correct copy of the original
9 and amended PAGA letters are attached hereto as Exhibit A and Exhibit B, respectively.

10 103. More than 65 days has elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice, but the Labor and
11 Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendant
12 Lakeview’s Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a
13 civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of
14 the Labor Code described in this First Amended Complaint. These penalties include, but are not
15 limited to, penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, and 2699(f)(2).

16 104. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendant Lakeview’s violation of
17 California Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person,
18 including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records
19 required by California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the
20 applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the
21 employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall also
22 be recorded. Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every employer shall
23 keep total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

24 105. During the time period of employment for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees,
25 Defendant Lakeview failed to maintain records pursuant to the Labor Code and IWC Orders by
26 failing to maintain accurate records showing meal periods. Defendant Lakeview’s failure to
27 provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and
28 the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency

1 of meal periods. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the
2 resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to
3 Defendant Lakeview. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and
4 continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest
5 on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant Lakeview to fully
6 perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof
7 at trial. Because of Defendant Lakeview's knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and
8 applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury
9 in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid
10 to them.

11 106. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiff is entitled to an award
12 of civil penalties on behalf of herself, the State of California, and similarly Aggrieved Employees
13 of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is an amount to be shown
14 according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted by law.

15 107. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant
16 to California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in any action
17 shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

18 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **(Against Defendant Zemel for Civil Penalties for Failure to Follow Wage and Hour** 20 **Laws, Cal. Lab. Code § 558.1)**

21 108. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 558.1(a), which states, "[a]ny employer or
22 other person acting on behalf of an employer, who violates, or causes to be violated, any provision
23 regulating minimum wages or hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare
24 Commission, or violates, or causes to be violated, Sections 203, 226, 226.7, 1193.6, 1194, or 2802,
25 may be held liable as the employer for such violation."

26 109. On information and belief, Defendant Zemel acted on behalf of an employer,
27 Defendant Lakeview, during the statutory period.

28 //

110. During the time period of employment for Plaintiff and the Class, Defendant Zemel failed to comply with wage and hour laws, including but not limited to failing to pay minimum wages, failing to pay overtime wages, failing to comply with meal and rest breaks, and failing to reimburse necessary expenses.

111. Moreover, on information and belief, Defendant Zemel dominated Defendant Lakeview, co-mingling assets and operated Defendant Lakeview as one of several alter egos Defendant Zemel utilizes to avoid liability for his wage and hour violations.

112. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of civil penalties on behalf of herself and the Class. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted by law.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated only with respect to the class claims, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

Class Certification

1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action;

2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class; and

3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

As to the First Cause of Action

4. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 204 and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all minimum wages due;

5. For general unpaid wages as may be appropriate;

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

7. For liquidated damages;

//

1 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
2 California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,

3 9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

4 As to the Second Cause of Action

5 10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
6 Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all
7 overtime wages due;

8 11. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;

9 12. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from
10 the date such amounts were due;

11 13. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
12 California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,

13 14. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

14 As to the Third Cause of Action

15 15. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
16 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

17 16. For unpaid meal period premium wages as may be appropriate;

18 17. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
19 such amounts were due;

20 18. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5,
21 and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

22 19. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

23 As to the Fourth Cause of Action

24 20. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
25 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

26 21. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate;

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

23. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

24. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

25. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders;

26. For general unpaid wages and reimbursement of business expenses as may be appropriate;

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

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

29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment;

31. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 for former employees who have left Defendants' employ;

32. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

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

34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

36. For penalties and actual damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);

37. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h);

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

2 39. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

3 As to the Eighth Cause of Action

4 40. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
5 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay wages for all hours worked
6 (including minimum and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain
7 accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, and failing to
8 maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods, failing to furnish accurate wage
9 statements, and failing to indemnify necessary business expenses;

10 41. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all Class Members and prejudgment
11 interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

12 42. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds
13 disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a
14 result of violations of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*;

15 43. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
16 California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5;

17 44. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California
18 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and,

19 45. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

20 As to the Ninth Cause of Action

21 46. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California
22 Labor Code by failing to pay all wages owed, including overtime, failure to provide meal periods,
23 failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods,
24 failing to pay final wages at termination, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;

25 47. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*, and all
26 other applicable Labor Code provisions;

27 48. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
28 California Labor Code § 2699; and,

49. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Tenth Cause of Action

50. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant Zemel violated the California Labor Code by failing to pay all wages owed, including overtime, failure to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, failing to pay final wages at termination, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;

51. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 558.1, and all other applicable Labor Code provisions;

52. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 558.1; and,

53. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to all Causes of Action

54. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: April 16, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

By: 

Kane Moon
H. Scott Leviant
Sandy Pham
Attorneys for Plaintiff

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury.

Dated: April 16, 2025

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

By: 

Kane Moon
H. Scott Leviant
Sandy Pham
Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT A

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
WWW.MOONLAWGROUP.COM

1055 W. SEVENTH ST., SUITE 1880
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017
TELEPHONE: (213) 232-3128
FACSIMILE: (213) 232-3125

Kane Moon, Esq.
Kmoon@moonlawgroup.com

March 17, 2024

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Lakeview Terrace Skilled Nursing Facility, LLC
904 Mission Street
South Pasadena, CA 91030

Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

Re: ***Tranekia Richards v. Lakeview Terrace Skilled Nursing Facility, LLC***

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Tranekia Richards (“Plaintiff”) to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against his former employer, Lakeview Terrace Skilled Nursing Facility, LLC (“Defendant”). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendant engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of Defendant’s aggrieved employees.

Plaintiff wishes to pursue a PAGA representative action on behalf of Plaintiff as an aggrieved employee, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of all other current and former aggrieved employees who worked for Defendant in California as an hourly paid, non-exempt employee at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the “Aggrieved Employees”).

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of Defendant suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

Factual Background Regarding Plaintiff's Employment with Defendant

Defendant owns and operates an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. As such, Defendant is subject to the California Labor Code and the Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”).

Plaintiff worked for Defendant as a nurse assistant, primarily in Los Angeles County. Defendant classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from overtime. During the time period that Plaintiff was employed by Defendant, Plaintiff typically worked 5 to 6 days per week, and in excess of 8 hours each workday.

Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendant committed numerous labor code violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendant was typical and illustrative.

Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Overtime

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime wages. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work off the clock, and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to wait in line in order to clock into work, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, during certain times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo temperature checks prior to clocking into work, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo COVID and temperature checks prior to clocking into work, including waiting in line, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes required to wait until the following shift employees arrived prior to leaving, off the clock and uncompensated. Also during the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes required to return home soon after arriving at work, without being paid reporting time pay.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including overtime.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s).

Despite these legal requirements, Defendant wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate written policies or practices providing meal periods for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of meal periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required meal periods. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods and that were not provided.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours).

Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Defendant, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10 minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendant did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendant cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Defendant are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendant's records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendant. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendant's knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 1174.5 for failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods.

Failure to Reimburse and Indemnify Expenses

California Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to reimburse employees for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of the employer.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendant without reimbursement, which included the purchase of masks and specific types of scrubs, as well as the occasional use of personal cellular telephones for work purposes. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, and Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

Failure to Pay All Accrued Vacation Wages at Termination

Labor Code § 227.3 requires employers to pay employees for all unused vested vacation time at their final rate of pay upon termination of their employment.

During the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the correct amount of vacation pay owed at the termination of

employment. For instance, when Plaintiff's employment with Defendant terminated, he was owed vacation wages at his true final wage rate on his final pay check from Defendant even though he had accrued unused vacation time. On information and belief, Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff the correct amount of vacation pay was not a single, isolated incident, but was instead part of Defendant's policy and practice that applied to the Aggrieved Employees.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay all accrued vacation wages at termination.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendant failed, and continues to fail to pay Plaintiff and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendant's employ. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum and straight time wages), missed meal periods, and missed rest periods.

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

Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides: “An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.” (Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).)

Defendant intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify hourly rates, the failure to correctly list gross wages earned, and the failure to list the true net wages earned, including wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and correct wages earned for all hours worked.

As a result of Defendant violating Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

Accordingly, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendant’s failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 dollars per employee.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

Based on its failure to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Defendant also violated Labor Code § 204.

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for hours worked. However, during all such times, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Defendant owes employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

1. Labor Code § 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7, 512 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
5. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse and indemnify employees for expenses and losses in the direct consequence and discharge of their duties;
6. Labor Code § 227.3 by failing to pay all vacation wages at termination;
7. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
8. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and

9. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month.

Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff seeks applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, and 2699(f)(2).

Plaintiff has placed Defendant on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence to its corporate address, as indicated on the first page.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Kane Moon', is written over the printed name.

Kane Moon, Esq.
Attorney at Law

EXHIBIT B

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
WWW.MOONLAWGROUP.COM

725 S. FIGUEROA ST., 31ST FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017
TELEPHONE: (213) 232-3128
FACSIMILE: (213) 232-3125

Kane Moon, Esq.
Kmoon@moonlawgroup.com

October 24, 2024

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Lakeview Terrace Skilled Nursing Facility, LLC
904 Mission Street
South Pasadena, CA 91030

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

South Pasadena Care Center, LLC
904 Mission Street
South Pasadena, CA 91030

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Elliot Zemel
831 S. Lake Street
Los Angeles, CA 90057

Third Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

Re: ***Tranekia Richards v. South Pasadena Care Center, LLC and Elliot Zemel***

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Tranekia Richards (“Plaintiff”) to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against his former employer, Lakeview Terrace Skilled Nursing Facility, LLC (“Defendant Lakeview”), which is allegedly affiliated with South Pasadena Care Center, LLC (“Defendant South Pasadena”) and Elliot Zemel (“Defendant Zemel”) (collectively, “Defendants”). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations, which we allege Defendants engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of Defendants’ aggrieved employees.

Plaintiff wishes to pursue a PAGA representative action on behalf of Plaintiff as an aggrieved employee, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of all other current and former aggrieved employees who worked for Defendants in California as an hourly paid, non-exempt

employee at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the “Aggrieved Employees”).

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of Defendants suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

Factual Background Regarding Plaintiff's Employment with Defendants

Defendants owns and operates an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. As such, Defendants are subject to the California Labor Code and the Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”).

Plaintiff worked for Defendant Lakeview as a nurse assistant, primarily in Los Angeles County. Defendant Lakeview is allegedly affiliated with Defendant South Pasadena and Defendant Zemel.

Further, Defendant Zemel, an individual, controls and dominates Defendant Lakeview and Defendant South Pasadena. On information and belief, Defendant Zemel operates Defendant Lakeview and Defendant South Pasadena as his alter ego, comingling assets; disregarding legal formalities; inadequately capitalizing both Defendant Lakeview and Defendant South Pasadena; using both Defendant Lakeview and Defendant South Pasadena as a mere shell; manipulating assets and liabilities of Defendant Lakeview and Defendant South Pasadena so as to deplete assets of Defendant Lakeview and Defendant South Pasadena; using Defendant Lakeview and Defendant South Pasadena to conceal his individual business activities; and using Defendant Lakeview and Defendant South Pasadena to avoid personal obligations.

Defendants classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from overtime. During the time period that Plaintiff was employed by Defendants, Plaintiff typically worked 5 to 6 days per week, and in excess of 8 hours each workday.

Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendants committed numerous labor code violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendants was typical and illustrative.

Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Overtime

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. “Hours worked” is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime wages. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work off the clock, and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to wait in line in order to clock into work, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, during certain times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo temperature checks prior to clocking into work, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo COVID and temperature checks prior to clocking into work, including waiting in line, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes required to wait until the following shift employees arrived prior to leaving, off the clock and uncompensated. Also during the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes required to return home soon after arriving at work, without being paid reporting time pay.

As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including overtime.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s).

Despite these legal requirements, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendants did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of

work. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate written policies or practices providing meal periods for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendants have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of meal periods. Defendants also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required meal periods. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s). Defendants, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods and that were not provided.

As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Defendants, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendants regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10 minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendants did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendants have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendants also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendants did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendants cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Defendants, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Defendants, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendants' records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendants' knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 1174.5 for failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods.

Failure to Reimburse and Indemnify Expenses

California Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to reimburse employees for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of the employer.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants without reimbursement, which included the purchase of masks and specific types of scrubs, as well as the occasional use of personal cellular telephones for work purposes. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendants, and Defendants has failed to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

Failure to Pay All Accrued Vacation Wages at Termination

Labor Code § 227.3 requires employers to pay employees for all unused vested vacation time at their final rate of pay upon termination of their employment.

During the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the correct amount of vacation pay owed at the termination of employment. For instance, when Plaintiff's employment with Defendants terminated, he was owed vacation wages at his true final wage rate on his final pay check from Defendants even though he had accrued unused vacation time. On information and belief, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff the correct amount of vacation pay was not a single, isolated incident, but was instead part of Defendants' policy and practice that applied to the Aggrieved Employees.

As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay all accrued vacation wages at termination.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e., was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and continues to fail to pay

Plaintiff and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum and straight time wages), missed meal periods, and missed rest periods.

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

Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

Moreover, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides: "An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney's fees." (Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).)

Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify

hourly rates, the failure to correctly list gross wages earned, and the failure to list the true net wages earned, including wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and correct wages earned for all hours worked.

As a result of Defendants violating Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

Accordingly, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 dollars per employee.

Moreover, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

Based on its failure to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Defendants also violated Labor Code § 204.

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for hours worked. However, during all such times, Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendants, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendants, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Defendants owe employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

1. Labor Code § 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7, 512 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;

3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
5. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse and indemnify employees for expenses and losses in the direct consequence and discharge of their duties;
6. Labor Code § 227.3 by failing to pay all vacation wages at termination;
7. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
8. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
9. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month.

Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff seeks applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, and 2699(f)(2).

Plaintiff has placed Defendants on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence to its corporate address, as indicated on the first page.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

MOON LAW GROUP, PC



Kane Moon, Esq.
Attorney at Law

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

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 725 S. Figueroa St., 31st Floor, Los Angeles, California 90017.

On the date indicated below, I served the document described as: **SECOND AMENDED CLASS ACTION AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT** on the interested parties in this action by sending [] the original [or] [✓] a true copy thereof [✓] to the interested parties as follows [or] [] as stated on the attached service list:

Joshua Sable, Esq. 7590 N. Glenoaks Blvd, Suite 200 Burbank, CA 91504 E-mail: jsable@cpehr.com Counsel for Defendant, LAKEVIEW SKILLED NURSING FACILITY, LLC	John Tsumura, Esq. General Counsel (619) 708-5826 E-mail: john@westharborhc.com Counsel for Defendant, TOPANGA BEACH HOLDINGS LLC
José-Manuel A. De Castro 7590 N. Glenoaks Blvd., Suite 201 Los Angeles, CA 91504 Fax: (310) 341-2330 E-mail: jmdecastro@decastrolawgroup.com Counsel for Defendant, SOUTH PASADENA CARE CENTER, LLC	Elliot Zemel 904 Mission Street South Pasadena, CA 91030 Agent for Defendant, SOUTH PASADENA CARE CENTER, LLC

[✓] **BY MAIL (ENCLOSED IN A SEALED ENVELOPE):** I deposited the envelope(s) formailing in the ordinary course of business at Los Angeles, California. I am “readily familiar” with this firm’s practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, sealed envelopes are deposited with the U.S. Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California.

[✓] **BY E-MAIL:** I hereby certify that this document was served from Los Angeles, California, by e-mail delivery on the parties listed herein at their most recent known e-mail address or e-mail of record in this action.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this **April 16, 2025**, at Los Angeles, California.

Jill Eaton

Name

jill eaton

Signature