

ERIC A. GROVER (SBN 136080)
eric.grover@kellergrover.com
ROBERT W. SPENCER (SBN 238491)
robert.spencer@kellergrover.com
KELLER GROVER LLP
1965 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94103
Telephone: (415) 543-1305
Facsimile: (415) 543-7861

Attorneys for Plaintiff
APRIL THOMASON

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF EL DORADO**

APRIL THOMASON, on behalf of herself, and)
all aggrieved employees,)

Plaintiff,)

v.)

SEQUOIA SENIOR LIVING LLC, and DOES)
1 through 50, inclusive,)

Defendants.)

Case No: 24CV0979

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

**REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

- 1. VIOLATIONS OF THE LABOR CODE;**
- 2. PENALTIES; and**
- 3. ATTORNEYS' FEES.**

Plaintiff APRIL THOMASON, on behalf of herself and all aggrieved employees, complains against Defendants SEQUOIA SENIOR LIVING LLC, and Does 1 through 50 (all referred to collectively as “Defendants” or “SEQUOIA”) as follows:

I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claims, based on, among other statutes, California Labor Code §§ 201-203, 204, 224, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, and 2802. Plaintiff has complied with all California Labor Code § 2699.3 requirements for commencing a civil action under the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”).

2. Plaintiff is not suing in her individual capacity. Plaintiff is proceeding herein solely under PAGA in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California for all aggrieved employees, including herself and other aggrieved employees. Plaintiff seeks no individual PAGA penalties or other individual relief in this action. A representative plaintiff in a PAGA action maintains standing while seeking non-individual PAGA penalties. *Balderas v. Fresh Start Harvesting, Inc.* (2024), 2024 Cal. App. LEXIS 264.

3. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the parties because, at all relevant times, Plaintiff was a California resident who worked in California for Defendants and Defendants systematically and continuously have conducted business in the State of California.

4. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 395.5 because (a) Plaintiff performed part of her duties in El Dorado County, (b) part of the of the obligations of the parties arises in El Dorado County, (c) part of Defendants’ liability arises in El Dorado County, and (d) breaches by Defendants occurred in connection with work performed partly in El Dorado County.

II. PARTIES AND BACKGROUND

5. Plaintiff April Thomason is an adult who worked for Defendants from approximately April 27,2023 through September 2023 as an hourly caregiver at Defendant’s

1 facilities in Cameron Park, California.¹

2 6. Defendant SEQUOIA SENIOR LIVING LLC is a Delaware limited liability
3 company doing business throughout California and is a “person” as defined by California Labor
4 Code § 18 and California Business and Professions Code § 17201. In addition, it is an
5 “employer” as that term is used in the California Labor Code and in the California Industrial
6 Welfare Commission’s Orders regulating wages, hours, and working conditions.

7 7. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of Defendants sued as Does 1
8 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sues those Defendants by those fictitious names. Plaintiff
9 will amend this Complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is
10 informed and believes and, on that ground, alleges that each of the fictitiously-named Defendants
11 is responsible in some manner for the occurrences alleged and that Plaintiff’s damages and other
12 losses as alleged are proximately caused by those occurrences.

13 8. On behalf of the State of California and all aggrieved employees who worked as
14 hourly non-exempt employees in California at any time or times during the applicable statute of
15 limitations, including all hourly non-exempt nurses and all hourly non-exempt caregivers,
16 Plaintiff seeks all applicable non-individual penalties, interest, attorneys’ fees, costs and other
17 sums for each violation of: (a) California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1 1198
18 and 1199 and IWC Wage Order No. 5 (failure to pay wages, including minimum wages and
19 overtime, for all hours worked), (b) California Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198 and 1999 and the
20 IWC Wage Order No. 5 (failure to provide meal periods); (c) California Labor Code § 226.7,
21 1198 and 1199 and IWC Wage Order No. 5 (failure to authorize and permit rest breaks); (d)
22 policy and practice of violating California Labor Code §§ 226 and 226.3 (failure to provide
23 accurate itemized wage statements); (e) California Labor Code § 204 (failure to pay aggrieved
24 employees in a timely manner), (f) California Labor Code §§ 201-203 (failure to pay former
25 aggrieved employees all wages due and owing at the time of discharge or voluntary quit), and (g)
26 California Labor Code § 2802 (failure to reimburse aggrieved employees for all necessary

27 ¹ Plaintiff previously worked for Defendants from approximately March 2020 through October
28 2022, however that is outside the applicable PAGA statute of limitations.

expenditures and losses incurred at the direction of and/or on behalf of Defendants).

III. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

9. This is a representative action under Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*, seeking non-individual PAGA penalties interest, attorneys' fees, costs, and other sums for violations of the Labor Code.

10. SEQUOIA operates assisted living and memory care facilities throughout California. SEQUOIA employees hourly non-exempt nurses as well as hourly non-exempt caregivers.

11. At all relevant times to this action, Plaintiff performed work for SEQUOIA as an hourly caregiver. As an hourly caregiver, Plaintiff typically worked five to six days a week. She typically worked shifts of eight hours or more, including numerous shifts over 10- and 12-hours, and even worked double-shifts lasting 16-hours.

12. Defendants have implemented a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees statutorily-mandated overtime pay by failing to pay them their entire hourly rate and/or premium wages and, at times, any wages at all, including the minimum wage, for compensable time spent under SEQUOIA's direction and control in violation of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 1199 and IWC Wage Order 5-2001. Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were required to work during their meal periods while clocked-out due to understaffing and having to assist residents. As such, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees did not receive any pay whatsoever for this time. In addition, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees occasionally had to take work related telephone calls at home and were not paid for this time.

13. At all relevant times, California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and the IWC Wage Order No. 5 required employers to provide employees with a first meal period of not less than 30 minutes during which they are relieved of all duty (referred to as "duty-free") before working more than five hours, and a second duty-free meal period of not less than 30 minutes before working more than 10 hours in a day. As alleged herein, SEQUOIA employed a policy and practice of failing to provide all meal periods to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees. Plaintiff

1 estimates that she missed her first meal period approximately three to four times per week due to
2 understaffing and a lack of relief. Plaintiff also worked numerous shifts over 10- and 12- hours a
3 day. Despite being eligible to receive two meal periods on such shifts, Plaintiff estimates that she
4 only received a second meal period less than five times during her employment, despite working
5 many more shifts where she is owed second meal period. On information and belief, other
6 aggrieved employees also missed their meal periods.

7 14. At all relevant times, California Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order No. 5
8 required employers to authorize and permit a paid rest break of at least 10 minutes for every four
9 hours of work performed or major fraction thereof. An employee working more than ten hours in
10 a single workday is entitled to three paid rest breaks, each lasting at least 10 minutes. As alleged
11 herein, SEQUOIA employed a policy and practice of failing to permit and authorize rest periods
12 and/or paying rest period premiums to aggrieved employees for such rest periods not provided, in
13 violation of the Labor Code and Wage Order 5-2001. Plaintiff frequently did not receive her paid
14 rest breaks and did not receive premium pay for any of these rest break violations. On information
15 and belief, other aggrieved employees also missed their rest periods.

16 15. California Labor Code § 226 provides that every employer is required,
17 “semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages,” to provide each employee with an
18 itemized wage statement setting forth, *inter alia*, the total hours worked by the employee (except
19 for salaried employees) and “all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
20 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.” Cal. Lab. Code §
21 226(a). Defendants implemented a policy and practice of violating California Labor Code § 226
22 by failing to provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and other
23 aggrieved employees in that the wage statements provided did not, among other things, display
24 the correct “total hours worked” and “gross wages earned” in violation of California Labor Code
25 § 226(a). They are also missing premium pay for missed meal periods and rest breaks. Through
26 its violation of Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants also violated Labor Code § 226.3.

27 16. SEQUOIA employed a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and other
28 aggrieved employees all wages due and owing in a timely manner as required by California Labor

Code § 204.

17. Defendants had a policy and practice of violating California Labor Code §§ 201-203 by failing to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees all wages due and owing at the time of discharge or voluntary quit. Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees who no longer are employed by Defendants still are owed minimum wages and overtime, as well as premium pay for missed meal periods and rest breaks.

18. Defendants implemented a policy and practice of violating California Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for necessary expenditures and losses incurred in their work for Defendants. SEQUOIA required Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees to utilize their personal cellular telephones for work purposes. While there were limited radios available, Defendants resorted to contacting Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees on their personal cellular telephones. Defendants did not reimburse Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for the cost of their cellular telephone service in violation of California Labor Code § 2802.

IV. REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

19. Plaintiff seeks to represent all aggrieved employees within the meaning of Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* who, within the applicable limitations period, up to the present and until compliance with the law, performed work in California.

20. On behalf of all aggrieved employees, Plaintiff seeks all non-individual PAGA penalties under Labor Code §§ 226.3 and 2699(f), as applicable, for each violation of Labor Code, including:

- (a) §§ 226.7, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198 and 1999 and IWC Wage Order No. 5 (failure to pay minimum wages and overtime);
- (b) §§ 226.7, 512(a), 1198 and 1199 and IWC Wage Order No. 5 (failure to provide meal periods);
- (c) §§ 226.7, 1198 and 1199 and IWC Wage Order No. 5 (failure to provide rest breaks);
- (d) §§ 226(a) and 226.3 (failure to provide itemized wage statements);

- (e) § 204 (failure to pay wages in a timely manner);
- (f) §§ 201-203 (failure to pay wages upon termination); and
- (g) § 2802 (failure to reimburse business expenses); and

21. The State of California has an enforcement interest in the questions of law and fact affecting the aggrieved employees whom Plaintiff seeks to represent. The aggrieved employees' claims against Defendants involve questions of common or general interest, including but not limited to whether Defendants: (1) violated the Labor Code and IWC Wage Order No. 5 by failing to pay any wages, including minimum wages and overtime, to aggrieved employees workers for various hours worked, including time spent working and assisting residents while clocked-out on meal periods; (2) violated the Labor Code and IWC Wage Order No. 5 by failing to provide aggrieved employees with all of their required off-duty meal periods and failing to pay the required missed-meal-period premiums for each meal period that was not provided; (3) violated the Labor Code and IWC Wage Order No. 5 by failing to authorize and permit aggrieved employees to take all of their required paid rest breaks and failing to pay the required missed-rest-break premium for each paid rest break not allowed or permitted; (4) violated Labor Code §§ 226 and 226.3 by failing to provide aggrieved employees with accurate and itemized wage statements; (5) violated Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay aggrieved employees their wages in a timely manner as required by that section; (6) violated Labor Code §§ 201-203 by failing to pay departing aggrieved employees all wages due at the time of discharge or voluntary quit; and (7) violated Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse aggrieved employees for all necessary expenditures and losses incurred in the direct consequence of the discharge of their duties.

22. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the aggrieved employees whom Plaintiff seeks to represent on a representative basis and her interests are consistent with, and not antagonistic to, those of the other aggrieved employees. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the aggrieved employees whom she seeks to represent because Plaintiff is also an aggrieved employee and her claims are typical of those of the aggrieved employees. Plaintiff has retained attorneys who are experienced in the prosecution of representative actions and Plaintiff intends to prosecute this action vigorously.

23. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all aggrieved employees that predominate over any other questions affecting only individual aggrieved employees.

24. Plaintiff requests permission to amend the Complaint to include additional representatives if Plaintiff is deemed not to be an adequate representative of the aggrieved employees.

V. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

**(UNPAID WAGES, OVERTIME PAY AND MINIMUM WAGES –
LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004)**

25. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each paragraph above as though fully set forth herein.

26. California Labor Code § 2699(f) permits “aggrieved employees” to recover certain penalties on their own behalf and on behalf of other current and former employees.

27. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” as that term is defined in the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 because she is a person who was employed by the alleged violators and against whom one or more of the alleged violations were committed.

28. Plaintiff has met all the Labor Code § 2699.3 requirements to commence a civil action against Defendants for violations of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198 and 1199 as well IWC Wage Order No. 5.

29. By the actions alleged in this complaint, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees any wages, including minimum wages and overtime pay, for certain hours worked, all in violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198 and 1199 as well as IWC Wage Order No. 5.

30. Therefore, Plaintiff, on behalf of and all current and former aggrieved employees, demands the non-individual penalties provided by Labor Code § 2699(f) for violations of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198 and 1199 as well as IWC Wage Order No. 5.

31. Plaintiff further seeks reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs under Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief as set forth below.

VI. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS –

LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004)

32. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each paragraph above as though fully set forth herein.

33. California Labor Code § 2699(f) permits “aggrieved employees” to recover certain penalties on their own behalf and on behalf of other current and former employees.

34. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” as that term is defined in the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 because she is a person who was employed by the alleged violators and against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed.

35. Plaintiff has met all the Labor Code § 2699.3 requirements to commence a civil action against Defendants for violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198 and 1199 and IWC Wage Order No. 5.

36. By the actions alleged herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees to take their required meal periods in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198 and 1199 and IWC Wage Order No. 5.

37. Therefore, Plaintiff, on behalf of and all current and former aggrieved employees, demands the non-individual penalties provided by Labor Code § 2699(f) for violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198 and 1199 and IWC Wage Order No. 5.

38. Plaintiff further seeks reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs under Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief as set forth below.

VII. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE AND PERMIT REST PERIODS –

LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004)

39. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each paragraph above as though fully set forth herein.

40. California Labor Code § 2699(f) permits “aggrieved employees” to recover certain

penalties on their own behalf and on behalf of other current and former employees.

41. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” as that term is defined in the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 because she is a person who was employed by the alleged violators and against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed.

42. Plaintiff has met all the Labor Code § 2699.3 requirements to commence a civil action against Defendants for violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 1198 and 1199 and IWC Wage Order No. 5.

43. By the actions alleged herein, Defendants failed to authorize and permit aggrieved employees to take their required rest periods in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 1198 and 1199 and IWC Wage Order No. 5.

44. Therefore, Therefore, Plaintiff, on behalf of and all current and former aggrieved employees, demands the non-individual penalties provided by Labor Code § 2699(f) for violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 1198 and 1199 and IWC Wage Order No. 5.

45. Plaintiff further seeks reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs under Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief as set forth below.

VIII. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS – LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004)

46. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each paragraph above as though fully set forth herein.

47. California Labor Code § 2699(f) permits “aggrieved employees” to recover certain penalties on their own behalf and on behalf of other current and former employees.

48. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” as that term is defined in the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 because she is a person who was employed by the alleged violators and against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed.

49. Plaintiff has met all the Labor Code § 2699.3 requirements to commence a civil action against Defendants for violations of Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226.3.

1 50. By the actions alleged herein, Defendants have failed to comply with Labor Code
2 § 226(a) as it relates to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees. As alleged above, SEQUOIA
3 employs a policy and practice of failing to provide complete and accurate itemized wage
4 statements to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as required by Labor Code § 226(a) in that
5 the wage statements provided do not, among other things, display “all applicable hourly rates in
6 effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate,”
7 the correct “total hours worked,” and the “gross wages earned.” In addition, the wage statements
8 do not include premium pay for missed meal and rest periods.

9 51. Therefore, Plaintiff, on behalf of and all current and former aggrieved employees,
10 demands the non-individual Labor Code § 226.3 penalties provided for violations of Labor Code
11 § 226(a). (If Labor Code § 226.3 is found not to apply to Defendants’ violations of Labor Code §
12 226(a), Plaintiff alternatively will seek non-individual Labor Code § 2699(f) penalties.)

13 52. Plaintiff further seeks reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs under Labor Code §
14 2699(g)(1).

15 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief as set forth below.

16 **XVI. FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **(LABOR CODE § 204 –**

18 **LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004)**

19 53. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each paragraph above as though fully set forth
20 herein.

21 54. California Labor Code § 2699(f) permits “aggrieved employees” to recover certain
22 penalties on their own behalf and on behalf of other current and former employees.

23 55. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” as that term is defined in the Labor Code
24 Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 because she is a person who was employed by the alleged
25 violators and against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed.

26 56. Plaintiff has met all the Labor Code § 2699.3 requirements to commence a civil
27 action against Defendants for violations of Labor Code § 204.

28 57. By the actions alleged herein, Defendants have failed to comply with Labor Code

§ 204 as it relates to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees.

58. Therefore, Plaintiff, on behalf of and all current and former aggrieved employees, demands the non-individual penalties provided by Labor Code § 2699(f) for violations of Labor Code § 204.

59. Plaintiff further seeks reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

IX. SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(LABOR CODE §§ 201-203 –

LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004)

60. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each paragraph above as though fully set forth herein.

61. California Labor Code § 2699(f) permits "aggrieved employees" to recover certain penalties on their own behalf and on behalf of other current and former employees.

62. Plaintiff is an "aggrieved employee" as that term is defined in the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 because she is a person who was employed by the alleged violators and against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed.

63. Plaintiff has met all the Labor Code § 2699.3 requirements to commence a civil action against Defendants for violations of Labor Code §§ 201-203.

64. By the actions alleged herein, Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code §§ 201-203 as they relate to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees.

65. Therefore, Plaintiff, on behalf of and all current and former aggrieved employees, demands the non-individual penalties provided by Labor Code § 2699(f) for violations of Labor Code §§ 201-203.

66. Plaintiff further seeks reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief as set forth below.

//

//

X. SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(LABOR CODE § 2802 –

LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004)

67. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each paragraph above as though fully set forth herein.

68. Labor Code § 2699(f) permits “aggrieved employees” to recover certain penalties on their own behalf and on behalf of other current and former employees.

69. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” as that term is defined in PAGA because she is a person who was employed by the alleged violators and against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed.

70. Plaintiff has met all the Labor Code § 2699.3 requirements to commence a civil action against Defendants for violations of Labor Code § 2802.

71. By their actions as alleged herein, Defendants have failed to comply with Labor Code § 2802 as it relates to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees.

72. Therefore, Plaintiff, on behalf of and all current and former aggrieved employees, demands the non-individual penalties provided by Labor Code § 2699(f) for violations of Labor Code §§ 2802.

73. Plaintiff further seeks reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs under Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief as set forth below.

XVII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff prays for relief as follows:

- i. For non-individual civil penalties as specified by Labor Code § 2699(f) for Plaintiff and each current and former aggrieved employee for each violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198 and 1199 (failure to pay wages, including minimum wages and overtime, for all hours worked) during the applicable limitations period preceding the filing of the Complaint and up to and including the present and until the date of compliance with the law;

- ii. For non-individual civil penalties as specified by Labor Code § 2699(f) for Plaintiff and each current or former aggrieved employee for each violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512(a), 1198 and 1199 (missed meal periods) during the applicable limitations period preceding the filing of the Complaint and up to and including the present and until the date of compliance with the law;
- iii. For non-individual civil penalties as specified by Labor Code § 2699(f) for Plaintiff and each current or former aggrieved employee for each violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 1198 and 1199 (missed rest periods) during the applicable limitations period preceding the filing of the Complaint and up to and including the present and until the date of compliance with the law;
- iv. For non-individual civil penalties as specified by Labor Code § 226.3 for Plaintiff and each current or former aggrieved employee and on behalf of the State of California for each violation of Labor Code § 226(a) (failure to provide itemized wage statements) during the applicable limitations period preceding the original filing of the Complaint. (Should Labor Code § 226.3 be found not to apply to Defendants' violations of Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff alternatively seeks the non-individual civil penalties specified by Labor Code § 2699(f) for Plaintiff and each current or former aggrieved employee and on behalf of the State of California for each violation of Labor Code § 226(a) (failure to provide itemized wage statements) during the applicable limitations period preceding the original filing of the Complaint.)
- v. For non-individual civil penalties as specified by Labor Code § 2699(f) for Plaintiff and each current or former aggrieved employee for each violation of Labor Code § 204 (failure to pay wages in a timely manner) during the applicable limitations period preceding the filing of the Complaint and up to and including the present and until the date of compliance with the law;
- vi. For non-individual civil penalties as specified by Labor Code § 2699(f) for Plaintiff and each former aggrieved employee for each violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203 (failure to pay departing employees all wages due and owing) during the applicable limitations

period preceding the filing of the Complaint and up to and including the present and until the date of compliance with the law;

vii. For non-individual civil penalties as specified by Labor Code § 2699(f) for Plaintiff and each current or former aggrieved employee for each violation of Labor Code § 2802 (unreimbursed business expenses) during the applicable limitations period preceding the filing of the Complaint and up to and including the present and until the date of compliance with the law;

viii. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as allowed by law, including Labor Code § 2699(g)(1) and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5

ix. For all interest as required by Labor Code § 218.6 or any other applicable law; and

x. For such other and further relief as the Court should deem proper.

Dated: May 10, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

KELLER GROVER LLP

By:



ERIC A. GROVER

ROBERT SPENCER

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees