

Christopher Adams (S.B. # 266440)
chris@kjtlawgroup.com
Vache A. Thomassian (S.B. #289053)
vache@kjtlawgroup.com
Caspar Jivalagian (S.B. #282818)
caspar@kjtlawgroup.com
Levon S. Yepremian (S.B. #327709)
levon@kjtlawgroup.com
KJT LAW GROUP LLP
230 N. Maryland Ave. Suite 306
Glendale, CA 91206
Telephone: 818.507.8525

Attorneys for Plaintiff Jose Salome Jimenez

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

JOSE SALOME JIMENEZ, individually
and on behalf of all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

TOYON CATERING, INC. dba Dinah's
Family Restaurant, a Corporation; and
DOES 1-20, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND PENALTIES
UNDER PAGA:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wage (Labor §§ 558, 1194 *et seq.*, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, IWC Wage Order)
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages (Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194 *et seq.*, 1197.1, 1198, IWC Wage Order);
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a));
4. Failure to Provide Rest Periods (California Labor Code § 226.7);
5. Failure to Furnish Accurate Wage Statements (California Labor Code § 226);
6. Waiting Time Penalties (California Labor Code §§ 201-203);
7. Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act (California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*).

JURY TRIAL REQUESTED

Plaintiff Jose Salome Jimenez (“Plaintiff”) brings this action individually and on behalf of the State of California and on behalf of aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”), and alleges the following:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff brings this action to remedy wage-and-hour violations by Toyon Catering, Inc. and Does 1 through 20 (collectively, “Defendants”). For at least four years prior to the filing of this Complaint and through the present, Defendants have engaged in a uniform policy and systematic scheme of wage abuse against Plaintiff in violation of applicable California laws, including, without limitation, failing to provide meal and rest breaks, failing to pay minimum and overtime wages, failing to provide accurate wage statements, and failing to pay all earned wages upon separation of employment.

II. THE PARTIES

2. **Defendant Toyon Catering, Inc.** (“Toyon Catering”) is also known as Dinah’s Restaurant. Toyon Catering is a family-style restaurant operating since 1959 that specializes in traditional American cuisine and is located in Los Angeles, California. It conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in the state of California. At all times mentioned herein, Defendant Royal Textile was and is an employer covered by the California Labor Code and the California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order.

3. Plaintiff is unaware and ignorant of the true names and capacities of Defendants sued herein as **Does 1 through 20**, inclusive, and for that reason sues said Defendants by such fictitious names (the “Doe Defendants”).

4. Pursuant to Toyon Catering, Inc. Statement of Information filed with the California Secretary of State, Paul Marks is the Chief Executive Officer, Secretary, Chief Financial Officer, and the Director of Toyon Catering, Inc. Paul Marks is therefore liable for the claims alleged herein pursuant to labor code § 558.1 because he is an “other person” acting on behalf of Defendant, who violates or causes to be violated, certain Labor Code Sections herein.

5. At all times herein relevant, Defendants and the Doe Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, partners, joint-venturers, joint employers, alter-egos, representatives, servants,

employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at times relevant hereto were acting with the course and cope of theirs authority as such agents, partners, joint-venturers, joint employers, alter-egos, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and assigns, and all acts or omissions alleges herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization, and consent of each defendant designated herein. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that the acts of each Defendants are legally attributable to the other Defendants.

6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that each of the Doe Defendants are legally responsible for the events and happenings referred to in this Complaint, and unlawfully caused the injuries and damages to Plaintiff as alleged in this Complaint. Plaintiff will file and serve an amendment to this Complaint alleging the true names and capacities of the Doe Defendants when such true names, capacities, and involvement is ascertained.

7. **Plaintiff Jose Salome Jimenez** was employed by Defendant Toyon Catering as a cook from approximately October 31, 1972 to December 12, 2023 at Toyon Catering Los Angeles location as a non-exempt employee and was and is paid in whole or in part on an hourly basis. Plaintiff Jose Salome Jimenez is an individual residing in the County of Los Angeles, California.

8. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendants exercised control over the wages, hours, and working conditions of Plaintiff; suffered and permitted Plaintiff to work; and otherwise engaged Plaintiff to work, so as to create an employer-employee relationship between Defendants and Plaintiff. At all relevant times, Defendants were “employers” of Plaintiff within the meaning of all applicable California state laws.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

10. This Court has jurisdiction over this action under the California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specifically grant jurisdiction to any other court, and the issues are based solely on California statutes and law,

1 including the California Labor Code, California Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage
2 Orders, California Code of Civil Procedure, California Civil Code, and the California Business
3 and Professions Code.

4 11. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over Defendants, because they are
5 citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, and otherwise intentionally
6 avail themselves to the California market, including establishing its principal place of business and
7 transacting business in California.

8 12. Venue is proper in this Court, because the Defendants own and operate there
9 company and otherwise transacts business in the County of Los Angeles. And during all relevant
10 time periods, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants in the County of Los Angeles.

11 **IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

12 13. At all relevant times set forth in this Complaint, Defendants employed Plaintiff as an
13 hourly, non-exempt employees.

14 14. Plaintiff was covered under one or more IWC Wage Orders, California Labor
15 Code provisions relating to wage-and-hour laws, and other applicable wage orders, regulations, and
16 statutes, which imposed an obligation on the part of Defendants, among other things, to provide
17 uninterrupted meal and rest periods, to pay overtime wages, to pay wages for all hours worked, to
18 pay all wages due at separation of employment, and to provide accurate wage statements.

19 15. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants
20 engaged in a uniform policy and systematic scheme of wage abuse against Plaintiff, including,
21 without limitation, depriving Plaintiff of uninterrupted thirty-minute meal periods for work periods
22 of at least five hours; depriving Plaintiff of ten-minute rest periods for work periods of four hours
23 or major fractions; failing to compensate Plaintiff for all hours worked, including overtime wages;
24 failing to provide timely, accurate itemized wage statements; and failing to pay, within the time
25 constraints imposed by applicable laws, all earned compensation at separation of employment.

26 16. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants failed
27 to provide Plaintiff the required meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at
28 Plaintiff’s regular rate of pay when a meal break was missed during the relevant time period. This

1 was a result of Defendants' uniform policy and practice of failing to relieve Plaintiff from her job
2 duties. As a result of Defendants' demanding deadlines, Plaintiff was required to perform work as
3 ordered by Defendants for more than five hours during a shift without receiving a meal break.
4 Specifically, Defendants regularly and systematically schedule Plaintiff's meal breaks after her fifth
5 hour of work. Defendants had no policy, procedure, or practice for Plaintiff to report missed meal
6 periods or recover lost wages, and Defendants had no policy, procedure, or practice to provide
7 one hour of additional wages for each workday that the meal break was not provided.

8 17. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants failed
9 to provide Plaintiff rest periods of at least ten minutes per four hours worked, or major fraction
10 thereof, and failed to pay Plaintiff one hour of additional wages at Plaintiff's regular rate of pay
11 when a rest break was not provided during the relevant time period. Defendants had no policy,
12 procedure, or practice for Plaintiff to report missed rest breaks or recover lost wages, and
13 Defendants had no policy, procedure, or practice to provide one hour of additional wages for each
14 workday that the rest break was not provided.

15 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants failed
16 to provide Plaintiff wages, including overtime wages, for all hours worked, meaning the time during
17 which Plaintiff was subject to the control of Defendants, including all the time she was suffered or
18 permitted to work. This was a result of Defendants' uniform policy and practice of requiring
19 Plaintiff to work off-the-clock without paying him for all the time she was under Defendants'
20 control. Plaintiff was entitled to receive compensation for all hours worked, and she did not
21 receive compensation for all hours worked. Plaintiff worked over eight hours in a day, and/or forty
22 hours in a week during her employment with Defendants and Defendants failed to pay overtime
23 wages to Plaintiff for all hours worked more than eight hours in a day and/or forty hours per week.

24 19. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants have
25 unlawfully failed to provide timely, accurate, itemized wage statements to Plaintiff.

26 Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants have failed to pay all
27 compensation due and owing to Plaintiff upon separation.

28 **VI. PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

20. At all relevant times, PAGA was applicable to Plaintiff and her employment with Defendants. PAGA provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) for violations of the California Labor Code. As an alternative, these civil penalties may be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself and other current or former employees.

21. Plaintiff and other employees of Defendants are “aggrieved employees” as defined by PAGA, because they are all current or former employees of Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations were committed against them.

22. On or about April 2, 2024, Plaintiff gave written notice of Defendants’ violations of various provisions of the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Order to (a) the LWDA by filing with the LWDA through the LWDA website and (b) to Defendants by certified mail.

23. The LWDA did not provide notice of its intention to investigate Defendants’ violations within 65 calendar days of the April 2, 2024 notice.

24. In doing so, Plaintiff has satisfied the administrative prerequisites under PAGA to recover civil penalties against Defendants, in addition to the other remedies, for violations of California Labor Code §§ 201-203, 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 551, 552, 1194 *et seq.*, 1197, 1198, and 2802 and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

V. CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Pay Minimum Wage

(Violation of Labor Code §§ 558, 1194 *et seq.*, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, IWC Wage Order)
(By Plaintiff Against Each Defendant)

25. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges the paragraphs set forth above as though set forth fully herein.

26. California Labor Code § 204, the IWC Wage Orders, and other applicable laws and regulations, provide that an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.

27. California Labor Code § 1197 further provides, “The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission or by any applicable state or local law, is the minimum wage to be paid to

employees, and the payment of a lower wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.”

28. California Labor Code § 1194 establishes an employee’s right to recover unpaid wages, including interest, and the cost of suit. California Labor Code § 1198 further provides that the employment of an employee for longer than those fixed by the IWC Wage Orders is unlawful.

29. Defendants maintained and enforced policies and practices of refusing to pay Plaintiff for all hours worked. Defendants required Plaintiff to work without compensating him for all hours worked as required by the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

30. Defendants thus required Plaintiff to work under conditions prohibited by order of the IWC, in violation of those orders.

31. Defendants deprived Plaintiff of her rightfully earned minimum wage compensation, as a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ failure to pay said compensation. Under California Labor Code § 1194, Plaintiff is entitled to recover such amounts, plus interest thereon, reasonable attorneys’ fees, and costs. In addition, under California Labor Code § 1194.2, Plaintiff is entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum wages unlawfully unpaid, and interest thereon. Plaintiff is further entitled to attorneys’ fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

32. Furthermore, California Labor Code § 1197.1 provides for a civil penalty to be assessed against any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who fails to pay a wage less than the minimum fixed by law.

33. At all times relevant herein, Defendants routine and systematic practice of failing to pay Plaintiff a fixed sum of \$50.00 per day resulted in a failure to pay employee wages at the minimum fixed by law.

34. As a result of Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wage, Plaintiff is entitled to recover a penalty of \$100.00 for the initial violation for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which each employee was underpaid and \$250 for each subsequent violation for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which each employee was underpaid.

1 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

3 (Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194 et seq., 1197.1, 1198, IWC Wage Order)

4 (By Plaintiff Against Each Defendant)

5 35. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges the paragraphs set forth above as
6 though set forth fully herein.

7 36. California Labor Code § 204, the IWC Wage Orders, and other applicable laws and
8 regulations, provide that an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.

9 37. California Labor Code § 510 further provides that employees in California shall be
10 employed more than eight hours per workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond
11 their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

12 38. California Labor Code § 1194 establishes an employee's right to recover unpaid
13 wages, including overtime compensation and interest, and the cost of suit. California Labor Code
14 § 1198 further provides that the employment of an employee for longer than those fixed by the
15 IWC Wage Orders is unlawful.

16 39. Defendants maintained and enforced policies and practices of refusing to pay
17 Plaintiff for all hours worked. Defendants employed Plaintiff for more than eight hours per day
18 and more than 40 hours per workweek during the operative timeframe, but Defendants failed to
19 pay Plaintiff the correct applicable overtime rate for the number of overtime hours she worked as
20 required by the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

21 40. Defendants thus required Plaintiff to work under conditions prohibited by order of
22 the IWC, in violation of those orders.

23 41. Defendants deprived Plaintiff of her rightfully earned minimum wage compensation,
24 including overtime compensation, as a direct and proximate result of Defendants' failure to pay
25 said compensation. Under California Labor Code § 1194, Plaintiff is entitled to recover such
26 amounts, plus interest thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs.

27 42. Defendants owe Plaintiff overtime wages, has failed and refused, and continues to
28 fail and refuse, to pay the overtime wages owed. Additionally, Defendants did not include all the
required compensation in calculating the overtime rate of Plaintiff.

43. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff such premium overtime compensation and their miscalculation of the regular rate of pay violates the provisions of California Labor Code § 510 and § 1198, and the applicable IWC Wage Order and is therefore unlawful. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194, Plaintiff is entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees. In addition, under California Labor Code § 1194.2, Plaintiff is entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum wages unlawfully unpaid, and interest thereon. Plaintiff is further entitled to attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

44. Pursuant to Labor Code § 558, Plaintiff is entitled to recover a penalty of \$50.00 for the initial failure to compensate employees at the statutory overtime rate for any work in excess of eight hours in one day or any work in excess of 40 hours in any workweek and/or failure to compensate employees at the statutory double time rates for any work in excess of twelve hours in one day or any work in excess of 8 hours on the seventh day of a workweek in addition to any underpaid wages; and \$100.00 for each subsequent failure to compensate employees at the statutory overtime rate for any work in excess of eight hours in one day or any work in excess of 40 hours in any workweek and/or failure to compensate employees at the statutory double time rates for any work in excess of twelve hours in one day or any work in excess of 8 hours on the seventh day of a workweek in addition to any underpaid wages.

45. As a proximate result of Defendants' failure to pay overtime and/or double-time wages as alleged above, Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendants penalties pursuant to section 558 in an amount as may be established according to proof at trial.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

(Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, IWC Wage Order)

(By Plaintiff Against Each Defendant)

46. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges the paragraphs set forth above as though set forth fully herein.

47. Plaintiff regularly worked greater than five hours and on occasion greater than ten hours per day. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 512, an employer may not employ someone

1 for a shift of more than five hours without providing him or her with a meal period of not less than
2 thirty minutes or for more than ten hours without providing him or her with a second meal period
3 of not less than thirty minutes.

4 48. Despite the requirements of the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor
5 Code §§ 512 and 226.7, Defendants have had a policy and practice of not providing Plaintiff with
6 timely, uninterrupted first meal periods, and was similarly not provided with a second meal period
7 to the extent such should have been provided.

8 49. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with all required meal breaks of not less than
9 30 minutes pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order.

10 50. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7, Plaintiff is entitled to recover one hour
11 of premium pay for each day in which a lawful meal period was not provided. Plaintiff is further
12 entitled to attorneys' fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and pursuant to Labor
13 Code section 2699(g)(1), Plaintiff is entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs
14 relating to her claims for civil penalties.

15 51. Additionally, as a proximate result of Defendants' failure to provide meal breaks,
16 Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendants penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 558
17 in an amount as may be established according to proof at trial.

18 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **Failure to Provide Rest Periods**

20 (Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, IWC Wage Order)

21 (By Plaintiff Against Each Defendant)

22 52. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges the paragraphs set forth above as
23 though set forth fully herein.

24 53. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order, "[e]very employer shall authorize and
25 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
26 each work period. . . . [The] authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked
27 daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours worked or major fraction
28 thereof. . . . Authorized rest period time shall be counted as hours worked, for which there shall
be no deduction from wages." California Labor Code § 226.7(a) prohibits an employer from

1 requiring any employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the
2 IWC. Under these laws, Defendants were required to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take rest
3 periods, based upon the total hours worked at a rate of ten minutes net rest per four hours, or
4 major fraction thereof, with no deduction from wages.

5 54. Despite these requirements of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Defendants have
6 had a policy and practice of failing to authorize and provide Plaintiff with ten-minute rest periods
7 for every four hours worked, or major fraction thereof.

8 55. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, Plaintiff is entitled to recover one hour of
9 premium pay for each day in which a rest period was not provided. Plaintiff is further entitled to
10 attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and pursuant to California
11 Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), Plaintiff is entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs
12 relating to her claims for civil penalties.

13 56. Additionally, as a proximate result of Defendants' failure to provide rest breaks,
14 Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendants penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 558
15 in an amount as may be established according to proof at trial.

16 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **Failure to Furnish Accurate Wage Statements**

18 (Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226 & 226.3, IWC Wage Order)

19 (By Plaintiff Against Each Defendant)

20 57. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges the paragraphs set forth above as though
21 set forth fully herein.

22 58. California Labor Code § 226(a) and IWC Wage Order require employers semimonthly or
23 at the time of each payment of wages to furnish each employee with a statement itemizing, among
24 other things, all applicable hourly rates. Labor Code § 226(b) provides that if an employer
25 knowingly and intentionally fails to provide a statement itemizing, among other things, all
26 applicable hourly rates, then the employee is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or
27 fifty dollars for the initial violation and one hundred dollars for each subsequent violation, up to
28 four thousand dollars.

59. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to furnish Plaintiff with timely, itemized

statements as required by California Labor Code § 226(a) and IWC Wage Order. As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff in the amounts provided by Labor Code § 226(b) and for penalties, and attorneys' fees.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Pay Wages When Due and Waiting Time Penalties
(Violation of Labor Code §§ 200-203, IWC Wage Order)
(By Plaintiff Against Each Defendant)

60. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges paragraphs set forth above as though set forth fully herein.

61. Sections 201 and 202 of the California Labor Code requires that Defendants pay employees all wages due immediately if Defendants discharge an employee, and within 72 hours if an employee quits his or her employment. Section 203 of the California Labor Code provides that if an employer willfully fails to timely pay such wages the employer must, as a sanction and amount owed, continue to pay that employee's wages until the back wages are paid in full or an action is commenced. The sanction and amount owed cannot exceed 30 days of wages.

62. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Plaintiff was terminated from her employment with Defendants and has not received all forms of wages earned, including, but not limited to, compensation for non-provided meal and rest periods. In addition, Plaintiff resigned but Defendants have not unconditionally paid her earned wages upon separation of employment within the time frame mandated by California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Defendants' conduct in this regard has been willful.

63. Defendants willfully refused and continues to refuse to pay Plaintiff all wages earned in a timely manner as required by California Labor Code § 203. As a consequence of Defendants' willful conduct in not paying all earned wages, Plaintiff is entitled to 30 days of wages under California Labor Code § 203 for failure to pay legal wages.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Private Attorney General Act
(California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* [PAGA])
(By Plaintiff and Other Aggrieved Employees Against Defendants)

64. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-allege paragraphs set forth above as though set forth fully herein.

65. PAGA authorizes an aggrieved employee, on behalf of himself or other current or former employees, to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties against his or her employer pursuant to the procedures specified in California Labor Code § 2699.3. Plaintiff is an aggrieved employee within the meaning of PAGA, and pursuant to PAGA, Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil penalties on behalf of himself and other similarly aggrieved persons who are, or were employed, by Defendants and against whom one or more of the alleged violations were committed. If the employee prevails as private attorney general, the employer may be subject to civil penalties, of which the aggrieved employee is entitled to 25 percent.

66. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit under PAGA. Specifically, on or about April 2, 2024 Plaintiff gave written notice of Defendants' violations — including the facts and theories to support the violations — of various provisions of the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Order to (a) the LWDA by filing with the LWDA through the LWDA website and (b) to Defendants by certified mail.

67. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the California Labor Code within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice and more than 65 days have passed since the notice and the LWDA did not provide the parties notice that it intended to investigate her claims.

68. During the applicable time period preceding the filing of Plaintiff's notice to the LWDA, Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 201-203, 226, 226.7, 512(a), 1194, 1198, and 2802, and the applicable IWC Wage Order provisions, as alleged in more detail above.

69. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (f), and 2699.5, and 2699(g)(1), Plaintiff and similarly aggrieved employees are entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. To that end, Plaintiff seeks all relief entitled under PAGA for any penalties assessed against Defendants as a result of Defendants' California Labor Code violations, plus attorneys' fees and costs.

1 **VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for an award and judgment against Defendants jointly and
3 severally, as follows:

- 4 1. For compensatory damages;
- 5 2. For general damages;
- 6 3. For applicable penalties;
- 7 4. For injunctive relief on applicable causes of action;
- 8 5. For an award of interest, including prejudgment interest, at the legal rate;
- 9 6. For an award of attorneys' fees on the applicable causes of action;
- 10 7. For costs of suit incurred; and
- 11 8. For such other and further relief as the Court deems appropriate.


12 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

13 Plaintiff hereby demand a jury trial in this matter on all matters triable to a jury.

14 Dated: June 28, 2024

15 **KJT LAW GROUP, LLP**

16 By:

17 

18 Vache A. Thomassian, Esq.
19 Caspar Jivalagian, Esq.
20 Christopher A. Adams, Esq.
21 Levon S. Yepremian, Esq.
22 Attorneys for Plaintiff Jose Salome Jimenez