

AARON N. COLBY (State Bar No. 247339)
aaron@colbylegal.com
ZOE YUZNA (State Bar No. 268496)
zoe@colbylegal.com
COLBY LAW FIRM, PC
13263 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 203
Studio City, California 91604
Telephone: (818) 253-1599
Fax: (818) 475-1981

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
6/20/2024 12:00 AM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By Y. Tarasyuk, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff
DAMIAN ROMERO

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

DAMIAN ROMERO, an individual and as a
representative of aggrieved employees pursuant to
the Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA),

Plaintiff,

vs.

SPOEFE, INC., a corporation; and DOES 1 through
10 inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 24STCV15343

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR
PENALTIES PURSUANT TO:

1. PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT, LABOR CODE
SECTION 2698 ET SEQ.

Plaintiff Damian Romero ("Plaintiff") alleges and complains against Defendants Spoeffe, Inc. and
Does 1 through 10 (collectively, "Defendant") as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This is a representative action for penalties pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act
of 2004, Labor Code section 2698 *et seq.* ("PAGA").

2. Plaintiff worked for Defendant in Los Angeles, California.

3. PAGA allows for an aggrieved employee to recover penalties on behalf of himself and
other aggrieved employees. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks civil penalties on behalf of himself and other
aggrieved employees, along with attorney's fees and costs, pursuant to PAGA.

///

PARTIES | JURISDICTION | VENUE

1. Plaintiff, at all times relevant hereto, is and has been a resident of the State of California.

2. Defendant Spoeffe, Inc. (“Defendant”) operates a real estate management firm at 10401 Venice Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90034 (the “worksite”). Avi Shlanger is the owner and controlling operator of Defendant Spoeffe, Inc.

3. Defendant conducts business in the State of California.

4. Under California Code of Civil Procedure section 395(a), venue is proper in this County because Defendant resides in this County and/or Plaintiff’s alleged injuries herein occurred in this County.

5. The true names and capacities of the defendants named herein as Does 1 through 10, inclusive, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise, are unknown to Plaintiff who therefore sues such defendants by fictitious names pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Plaintiff believes that all of the Doe defendants are California residents. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to show such true names and capacities when they have been determined. Defendant and Doe Defendants are collectively referred to as “Defendant,” “Defendants” or “Defendant Employers.”

6. Plaintiff believes that, at all times relevant herein, each defendant designated, including Does 1 through 10, was the agent, managing agent, principal, owner, partner, joint venturer, representative, manager, servant, employee, and/or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, and was at all times mentioned herein acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment, and that all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization, and consent of each defendant designated herein.

7. Defendant, and each of them, acted in concert with one another to commit the wrongful acts alleged herein, and aided, abetted, incited, compelled and/or coerced one another in the wrongful acts alleged herein, and/or attempted to do so, including pursuant to Government Code section 12940(i). Defendant, and each of them, formed and executed a conspiracy or common plan pursuant to which they would commit the unlawful acts alleged herein, with all such acts alleged herein done as part of and pursuant to said conspiracy, intended to cause and actually causing Plaintiff harm.

///

///

ALTER EGO | AGENCY | JOINT EMPLOYER

8. There exists such a unity of interest and ownership between Defendant Employers that the individuality and separateness of Defendant Employers have ceased to exist. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant Employers, and each of them, were the agents, employees, managing agents, supervisors, coconspirators, parent corporation, joint employers, alter egos, successors, and/or joint ventures of the other Defendant Employers, and each of them, and in doing the things alleged herein, were acting at least in part within the course and scope of said agency, employment, conspiracy, joint employer, alter ego status, successor status and/or joint venture and with the permission and consent of each of the other Defendant Employers. Whenever and wherever reference is made in this complaint to any act or failure to act by a defendant or co-defendant, such allegations and references shall also be deemed to mean the acts and/or failures to act by each defendant acting individually, jointly and severally.

9. Plaintiff believes Defendant Employers were both Plaintiff's joint employer and are liable under the joint employer and single enterprise theories. *See Laird v. Capital Cities* (1998) 68 Cal.App.4th 727, 737-38 (four factors to prove single enterprise are "interrelation of operations, common management, centralized control of labor relations, and common ownership or financial control. ... Although courts consider the four factors together, they often deem centralized control of labor relations the most important."); *see also Vernon v. State of California* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 114, 128 (separate entities can also be deemed a "joint employer" by having the right to control the employment relationship, as evaluated by focusing on "an examination of defendant's role with respect to the right to hire, fire, transfer, promote, discipline, set the terms, conditions and privileges of employment, train and pay the plaintiff.")).

10. Defendant Employers were Plaintiff's employers, joint employers and/or special employers within the meaning of Government Code sections 12926 (d), 12940 (a),(h),(1), (h)(3)(A), (i), and, 12950, and regularly employ five (5) or more persons and are therefore subject to the jurisdiction of this Court. Defendant Employers were Plaintiff's employers, joint employers and/or special employers within the meaning of the Labor Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Order, and are each an "employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer" as such term is used in Labor Code sections 558 and/or 558.1, and liable to Plaintiff on that basis. Defendant Employers are Plaintiff's joint employers by virtue of a joint enterprise, and that Plaintiff was an employee of Defendant Employers.

1 Plaintiff performed services for each and every one of Defendant Employers, and to the mutual benefit
2 of all Defendant Employers, and all Defendant Employers shared control of Plaintiff as an employee,
3 either directly or indirectly, and the manner in which Defendant Employers' business was and is
4 conducted.

5 11. Labor Code section 558.1 provides that an employer or "other person acting on behalf of
6 an employer" who violates certain California wage and hour laws "may be held liable as the employer for
7 such violation." Labor Code section 558.1 defines "other person acting on behalf of an employer" as a
8 "natural person who is an owner, director, officer, or managing agent" of the employer. Labor Code
9 section 558.1(b). *See* Labor Code section 558(a) (authorizing civil penalties against "any employer or
10 other person acting on behalf of an employer" who causes overtime pay violations to occur."); *see Atempa*
11 *v. Pedrazzani*, 27 Cal.App.5th 809, 823-824 (2018); Labor Code section 1197.1 ("Any employer or other
12 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person" for failure to pay
13 minimum wages."); *see Reynolds v. Bement*, 36 Cal.4th 1075, 1089 (2005) ("aggrieved employees may
14 ... maintain civil actions to recover such penalties"); *see Reynolds v. Bement*, 36 Cal.4th 1075, 1089, fn.
15 10 (2005) (alter ego doctrine may be used in wage claim actions to impose liability on controlling directors
16 and shareholders); *see* Government Code section 12925(d) (defining "Person" as one *or more* individuals,
17 partnerships, associations, corporations, limited liability companies, legal representatives, trustees,
18 trustees in bankruptcy, and receivers or other fiduciaries).

19 12. Despite the formation of purported corporate existence, Defendant Employers are, in
20 reality, one and the same, including, but not limited to because: (a) Defendant Employers are completely
21 dominated and controlled by one another, who personally committed the frauds and violated the laws as
22 set forth in this complaint, and who have hidden and currently hide behind Defendant Employers to
23 perpetrate frauds, circumvent statutes, or accomplish some other wrongful or inequitable purpose; (b)
24 Defendant Employers derive actual and significant monetary benefits by and through one another's
25 unlawful conduct, and by using one another as the funding source for their own personal expenditures;
26 (c) Defendant Employers, while really one and the same, were segregated to appear as though separate
27 and distinct for purposes of perpetrating a fraud, circumventing a statute, or accomplishing some other
28 wrongful or inequitable purpose; (d) Defendant Employers does not comply with all requisite corporate

1 formalities to maintain a legal and separate corporate existence; (e) the business affairs of Defendant
2 Employers are, and at all times relevant were, so mixed and intermingled that the same cannot
3 reasonably be segregated, and the same are in inextricable confusion. Defendant Employers are, and at
4 all times relevant hereto were, used by one another as a mere shell and conduit for the conduct of certain
5 of Defendant Employers' affairs, and are, and were, the alter ego of one another. The recognition of
6 the separate existence of each of the Defendant Employers would not promote justice, in that it would
7 permit Defendant Employers to insulate themselves from liability to Plaintiff for violations of the law.
8 The corporate existence of Defendant Employers should each be disregarded in equity and for the ends of
9 justice because such disregard is necessary to avoid fraud and injustice to Plaintiff herein. Accordingly,
10 Defendant Employers constitute the alter ego of one another, and the fiction of their separate corporate
11 existence must be disregarded.

12 ADMINISTRATIVE EXHAUSTION

13 13. Plaintiff exhausted administrative requirements for Plaintiff's claims.

14 14. On March 14, 2024, Plaintiff's counsel gave written notice by online filing with the
15 California Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and by sending via certified mail to
16 Defendants a letter specifying the California Labor Code provisions Defendants violated, including the
17 facts and theories supporting the alleged violations, with amended notice filed online and sent by certified
18 mail on March 27, 2024. More than sixty-five (65) days have passed since Plaintiff's counsel submitted
19 the initial and amended letters to the LWDA and certified-mailed the letters to Defendants, and the LWDA
20 has not provided notice of intent to investigate the alleged violations, nor have Defendants provided notice
21 of intent or any efforts to cure. Accordingly, the statutory period for any investigation or response has
22 concluded and Plaintiff may commence this lawsuit pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, as provided by
23 subsection 2699.3.

24 FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

25 15. **Defendant.** Defendant Spoefe, Inc. operates a real estate management firm at 10401
26 Venice Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90034 (the "worksite"). Avi Shlanger is the owner and
27 controlling operator of Defendant Spoefe, Inc.

28 16. **Plaintiff's Hire & Job Details.** On or about October 1, 2022, Defendant hired Plaintiff

1 Damian Romero, a Hispanic man, as an employee in the job position of Maintenance Technician.

2 17. Plaintiff's job duties included traveling across Defendant's several locations to perform
3 maintenance work. Plaintiff reported to several supervisors over his employment with Defendant.

4 18. Defendant classified Plaintiff as a "non-exempt" employee paid \$23 per hour.

5 19. Plaintiff's work schedule was typically Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:30pm but
6 Plaintiff often had to work before and after, and check his mobile device.

7 20. Defendant reimbursed Plaintiff a flat monthly amount of \$300 for expenses incurred in
8 driving his personal vehicle and using his personal mobile device for work. However, Plaintiff's actual
9 business expenses incurred exceed this amount by no less than \$100 per month.

10 21. Defendant considered Plaintiff a high-performing employee. Plaintiff earned an employee
11 of the month bonus in late 2022. However, everything changed when Plaintiff reported a workplace injury
12 and sought a reasonable accommodation.

13 22. **Plaintiff Is Injured At Work And Seeks An Accommodation.** On September 26, 2023,
14 Plaintiff injured his hand at work while cutting a shower valve. Plaintiff notified his then supervisor, Alex
15 Lara, who instructed him to go to the workers' compensation clinic. Plaintiff had to get stitches and was
16 out for two weeks, during which time Defendant received medical reports as part of the workers'
17 compensation process.

18 23. On or about October 17, 2023, Plaintiff returned to work with medical restrictions that did
19 not require strength in his injured hand.

20 24. **Wrongful Termination.** On December 26, 2023, Plaintiff inquired about remaining
21 vacation days in the year. In response, Defendant fired Plaintiff. Jose [last name unknown] and Natalia
22 [last name unknown] called Plaintiff into the office and terminated him for attendance. Plaintiff was
23 shocked and asked for a record of his unexcused absences but instead they tried to get Plaintiff to sign a
24 separation agreement waiving claims for \$50. Plaintiff refused.

25 25. In truth, a substantial motivating reason for Defendant's decision to terminate Plaintiff's
26 employment was Plaintiff's protected classes (Hispanic) and/or protected conduct (seeking reasonable
27 accommodation), as alleged herein.

28 26. Other similarly situated employees who are not in the same protected classes as Plaintiff

and/or who did not engage in the same or similar protected conduct as Plaintiff did, in fact, engage in actions similar to Plaintiff and were not terminated for such actions.

27. **Rounding Time.** Defendant did not pay Plaintiff for the actual time worked based on Plaintiff's actual clock in/out times, but instead paid Plaintiff based on "rounded" clock in/out times. Defendant's rounding of clock in/out times led to an underpayment of wages to Plaintiff. Exhibit 1.

28. **Off-The-Clock Work.** Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff for all time worked. The off-the-clock work included, among other things according to proof: working during breaks, such as carrying on with work during a meal break; reviewing or responding to emails or texts from a mobile device or after hours; illegally "rounding" employee time at the beginning and/or end of the shift and/or the beginning and/or end of meal breaks; post-shift work completing tasks like clean-ups, dropping off equipment by heading to another site; traveling during work or on work-related errands to and from work; and/or work performed remotely or away from the work site where there is no time clock system.

29. **Overtime Work.** Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff for work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek at the rate of time-and-one-half (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and for work in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day overtime compensation at a rate of two (2) times the regular rate of pay.

30. **Meal Break Violations.** Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff with first or second timely, uninterrupted 30-minute meal break as required by law, according to proof. For instance, among other things according to proof: Plaintiff did not get meal breaks at all; Plaintiff was forced to work throughout Plaintiff's meal breaks; Plaintiff was "on-call" during meal breaks; Defendant automatically deducted unpaid meal break time from Plaintiff's time worked even though Plaintiff performed work during such time; Defendant rounded Plaintiff's clock in and out times for the start and end of meal breaks; Plaintiff's meal breaks were not timely; Plaintiff's meal breaks were interrupted; Plaintiff's meal breaks were less than the full 30 minutes; and/or Defendant required Plaintiff to remain on premises at the worksite during meal breaks.

///

31. **Rest Break Violations.** Defendant failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take a 10-minute rest break per each four (4) hour period worked or a major fraction thereof, according to proof. For instance, among other things according to proof: Plaintiff did not get rest breaks at all; Plaintiff was forced to work throughout Plaintiff's rest breaks; Plaintiff was "on-call" during rest breaks; Plaintiff's rest breaks were not timely; Plaintiff's rest breaks were interrupted; Plaintiff's rest breaks were less than the full 10 minutes; and/or Defendant required Plaintiff to remain on premises at the worksite during rest breaks.

32. **Unreimbursed Expenses.** Defendant failed to fully reimburse Plaintiff's reasonable business expenses incurred, according to proof, including: mobile device usage costs and travel costs

33. **Wage Statements.** Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff with uniform, complete, and accurate wage statements because the wage statements provided to Plaintiff failed to list the: accurate totals of the hours worked; number of hours worked at each hourly rate; net wages earned; and/or gross wages earned.

34. In addition, Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff with uniform, complete, and accurate wage statements because the wage statements fail to provide the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and the wage statements fail to show all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period. Exhibit 1.

35. **Final Pay.** Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff all wages owed to Plaintiff immediately upon Plaintiff's termination of employment, including earned and unpaid wages, such as: minimum wages; overtime wages; meal and rest period premium wages; and/or all wages owed for the final day of work.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION FOR PENALTIES PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE SECTION 2698

36. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding and subsequent paragraphs.

37. Under the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), Labor Code sections 2698-2699.5, private parties may recover civil penalties for violations of the Labor Code. These penalties are in addition to any other relief available under the Labor Code. As set forth above, Defendant has committed numerous violations of the Labor Code against Plaintiff, including but not limited to:

- 1 • **Labor Code §§ 201, 201.5, 202, 203.** Failure to pay all wages immediately upon termination or
2 within 72 hours after notice of separation.
- 3 • **Labor Code § 204.** Failure to pay all earned wages within the time prescribed in Labor Code §§
4 204(a) and 204(b).
- 5 • **Labor Code § 206.** Failure to pay all undisputedly owed wages.
- 6 • **Labor Code § 210.** Failure to pay wages as required by Labor Code §§ 201.3, 204, 204b, 204.1,
7 204.2, 205, 205.5, 227.3, and/or 1197.5.
- 8 • **Labor Code § 212.** Failure to include the name and address of established place of business in
9 the state on pay checks to cash or deposit pay checks.
- 10 • **Labor Code § 213.** Unauthorized payment of final wages via direct deposit.
- 11 • **Labor Code § 221.** Failure to not collect and receive owed wages.
- 12 • **Labor Code § 226.** Failure to provide timely and accurate wage statements.
- 13 • **Labor Code § 226.3.** Failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a).
- 14 • **Labor Code § 226.7.** Failure to provide rest periods and failure to provide an additional hour of
15 pay at the regular rate of compensation in lieu of the rest periods.
- 16 • **Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.** Failure to provide meal periods and failure to provide an
17 additional hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation in lieu of the meal periods.
- 18 • **Labor Code § 256.** Failure to pay all wages immediately upon termination or within 72 hours
19 after notice of separation.
- 20 • **Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194.** Failure to pay overtime and double time compensation.
- 21 • **Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197.** Failure to pay minimum wages, including overtime
22 and double time compensation at the minimum wage rate.
- 23 • **Labor Code § 558.** Violation of a section of the chapter of the Labor Code starting with Labor
24 Code § 500, *et seq.*, or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the
25 Industrial Welfare Commission.
- 26 • **Labor Code § 558.1.** Violation any provision regulating minimum wages or hours and days of
27 work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, and violating Labor Code §§ 203, 226,
28 226.7, 1193.1, and/or 1194.

- 1 • **Labor Code § 1174.** Failure to maintain compliant employee and payroll records.
- 2 • **Labor Code § 1197.1.** Failure to pay minimum wage.
- 3 • **Labor Code § 1199.** Violation of an order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.
- 4 • **Labor Code § 1198.** Violation of the following sections of orders of the Industrial Welfare
5 Commission for conditions of labor prohibited by such:
 - 6 ○ **Wage Order 1-2001 (or other applicable Wage Order), Section 3,** requiring an
7 employer to pay overtime and double time compensation.
 - 8 ○ **Wage Order 1-2001 (or other applicable Wage Order), Section 4,** requiring an
9 employer to pay minimum wages, including overtime and double time compensation at the
10 minimum wage rate.
 - 11 ○ **Wage Order 1-2001 (or other applicable Wage Order), Section 7,** requiring an
12 employer to maintain accurate information with respect to each employee; provide
13 employees with thorough and accurate itemized wage statements; and, provide clocks
14 within a reasonable distance from employees' work areas.
 - 15 ○ **Wage Order 1-2001 (or other applicable Wage Order), Section 11,** requiring an
16 employer to provide its employees with adequate meal periods and an additional hour of
17 pay at the regular rate of compensation in lieu of the rest periods.
 - 18 ○ **Wage Order 1-2001 (or other applicable Wage Order), Section 12,** requiring an
19 employer to provide its employees with adequate rest periods and an additional hour of pay
20 at the regular rate of compensation in lieu of the rest periods.
 - 21 ○ **Labor Code § 2802.** Failure to reimburse necessary business expenses.

22 38. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” within the meaning of California Labor Code section
23 2699(c), and a proper representative to bring a civil action on behalf of Plaintiff and other current and
24 former employees of Defendant pursuant to the procedures specified in California Labor Code section
25 2699.3, because Plaintiff is employed by Defendant and the alleged violations of the California Labor
26 Code were committed against Plaintiff.

27 39. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.3, Plaintiff gave written notice on January
28 24, 2024 by online filing to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by

certified mail to Defendant of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. More than 65 days have passed since Plaintiff provided written notice to the LWDA. The LWDA has not provided notice that it intends to investigate PLAINTIFF'S claims.

40. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.3, Plaintiff served Defendant with the aforementioned LWDA notice via certified mail on March 14, 2024. More than 33 days have passed since that date. Defendant has not provided Plaintiff with notice that it cured any of the violations alleged therein.

41. Per the tolling provision in Labor Code section 2699.3(g), the period of liability under Plaintiff's PAGA claim extends one year and sixty-five days before the filing of this complaint (the "PAGA Liability Period").

42. Accordingly, Plaintiff has complied with all of the requirements set forth in California Labor Code section 2699.3 to commence a representative action under PAGA.

43. Pursuant to PAGA, Plaintiff seeks civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other aggrieved employees, and the State of California according to proof, pursuant to the California Labor Code, including California Labor Code sections 2699(a) and 2699(f), which provides for \$100 for each initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee pay period. In addition, pursuant to PAGA, Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties, including but not limited to penalties under Labor Code sections 210, 225.5, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 1199 from Defendant in a representative action for the violations set forth above. Plaintiff is entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1).

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff demands a jury trial to the extent permitted for PAGA claims.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against Defendant as follows:

- a. For penalties where provided by law;
- b. For punitive damages where allowed by law;
- c. For prejudgment interest pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.6,

1 California Civil Code section 3287 and/or California Civil Code section 3288
2 and/or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest;

3 d. For attorneys' fees where allowed by law;

4 e. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

5 f. For such other and further relief as deemed just and proper
6

7 DATED: June 19, 2024

COLBY LAW FIRM, PC

8 

9 By: _____

10 AARON N. COLBY
11 ZOE YUZNA

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff
13 DAMIAN ROMERO
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1

10/24/2023

Damian Jr Romero

**1,573.35

***** One Thousand Five Hundred Seventy Three and 35/100

Damian Jr Romero
8709 Hazeltine Ave
Panorama City CA 91402

Romero, Damian Jr - 1494

Pay	10/24/2023 to 10/24/2023
Pay Frequency	Quarterly
Main Rate Reg/OT	23.00/34.50

Main Reg Hrs	88.00
Main OT Hrs	1.00
Main Reg Pay	1288.00
Main OT Pay	34.50
Main Other	552.00

Total Ded	301.15
PTO Sick Leave	
Used	13.00
Avail	28.14
Bal	28.14

	10/24/2023	YEAR
Gross Pay	1874.30	31464.00
Sec Sec	116.22	1850.77
Medicare	27.16	456.23
Fc With	117.00	1834.00
CA With	23.88	378.85
CA SDs	16.87	283.18
Net Pay	1673.35	26659.97

Software Version: 2023.04

Romero, Damian Jr - 1494

Pay	10/24/2023 to 10/24/2023
Pay Frequency	Quarterly
Main Rate Reg/OT	23.00/34.50

Main Reg Hrs	56.00
Main OT Hrs	1.00
Main Reg Pay	1288.00
Main OT Pay	34.50
Main Other	552.00

Total Ded	301.15
PTO Sick Leave	
Used	13.00
Avail	28.14
Bal	28.14

	10/24/2023	YEAR
Gross Pay	1874.30	31464.00
Sec Sec	116.22	1850.77
Medicare	27.18	456.23
Fc With	117.00	1834.00
CA With	23.88	378.85
CA SDs	16.87	283.18
Net Pay	1673.35	26659.97

Software Version: 2023.04



11/21/2023

Damian Jr Romero

**1,404.33

***** One Thousand Four Hundred Four and 33/100

Damian Jr Romero
8709 Hazeltine Ave
Panorama City CA 91402

Romero, Damlan Jr - 1494

For 11/03/2023 to 11/18/2023	Mon. Reg Hrs 72.00	Total Oed 251.87	11/21/2023	YEAR
Pay Frequency Biweekly	Mon. Reg Pay 1856.00		Gross Pay 1856.00	34845.00
Main Pay Rate 22.00			Soc Sec 182.57	2160.39
		PTO Sick Leave	Medicare 24.01	505.25
		Used 21.00	Fed WH 91.00	2024.00
		Avail 25.78	CA WH 19.08	419.53
		Bal 25.78	CA SOI 14.91	313.81
			Net Pay 1404.33	29422.22
FWM Status H Hse				
CA Status/Allow H Hse/D				

Software Release 2023.04

Romero, Damlan Jr - 1494

For 11/03/2023 to 11/18/2023	Mon. Reg Hrs 72.00	Total Oed 251.87	11/21/2023	YEAR
Pay Frequency Biweekly	Mon. Reg Pay 1856.00		Gross Pay 1856.00	34845.00
Main Pay Rate 22.00			Soc Sec 182.57	2160.39
		PTO Sick Leave	Medicare 24.01	505.25
		Used 21.00	Fed WH 91.00	2024.00
		Avail 25.78	CA WH 19.08	419.53
		Bal 25.78	CA SOI 14.91	313.81
			Net Pay 1404.33	29422.22
FWM Status H Hse				
CA Status/Allow H Hse/D				

Software Release 2023.04



12/19/2023

Damian Jr Romero

**1,404.34

***** One Thousand Four Hundred Four and 34/100

Damian Jr Romero
8709 Hazeltine Ave
Panorama City CA 91402

Romero, Damian Jr - 1494

For	12/01/2023 to 12/14/2023	Main: Reg Hrs	64.00	Total Ded	251.66		
Pay Frequency	Biweekly	Main: Reg Pay	1472.00	PTO Sick Leave		Gross Pay	12/19/2023
Main Pay Rate	23.00	Main: Sick Leave	184.00	Used	37.00	Soc Sec	102.67
				Avail	11.00	Medicare	24.01
				Bal	11.00	Fed WH	91.00
FWH Status	H Hse					CA WH	19.08
CA Status/Allow	H Hse/0					CA SDI	14.90
						Net Pay	1404.34
							32049.48

Software Version 2023.06

Romero, Damian Jr - 1494

For	12/01/2023 to 12/14/2023	Main: Reg Hrs	64.00	Total Ded	251.66		
Pay Frequency	Biweekly	Main: Reg Pay	1472.00	PTO Sick Leave		Gross Pay	12/19/2023
Main Pay Rate	23.00	Main: Sick Leave	184.00	Used	37.00	Soc Sec	102.67
				Avail	11.00	Medicare	24.01
				Bal	11.00	Fed WH	91.00
FWH Status	H Hse					CA WH	19.08
CA Status/Allow	H Hse/0					CA SDI	14.90
						Net Pay	1404.34
							32049.48

Software Version 2023.06

