

DOUGLAS HAN (SBN 232858)
SHUNT TATAVOS-GHARAJEH (SBN 272164)
JAMIE NGUYEN (SBN 340020)
JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION
751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101
Pasadena, California 91103
Telephone: (818) 230-7502
Facsimile: (818) 230-7259

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF VENTURA**

SCOUT WARDLAW, individually, and on
behalf of other members of the general public
similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

v.

DIOJI, INC. DBA DIOJI K-9 RESORT &
ATHLETIC CLUB, a California corporation;
and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: 2024CUOE028009

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR
CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION
OF LABOR CODE § 2698, *et seq.*
(PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT OF 2004)**

VENTURA SUPERIOR COURT

FILED

11/21/2025

K. Bieker
Executive Officer and Clerk

Nina Lemos
Nina Lemos

1 Plaintiffs SCOUT WARDLAW and MACKENZIE CHASE (“Plaintiff,” “Plaintiff
2 Wardlaw,” and “Plaintiff Chase”) hereby submit this Complaint against Defendant DIOJI, INC.
3 DBA DIOJI K-9 RESORT & ATHLETIC CLUB and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive
4 (collectively, “Defendants”) as an exclusively representative action on behalf of other current and
5 former aggrieved employees of Defendants for penalties as follows:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. This representative action is brought pursuant to Labor Code section 2698,
8 *et seq.* (the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”)) for Defendants’ violations of Labor
9 Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a),
10 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.
11 Plaintiff seeks only to prosecute her non-individual PAGA claims and does not seek to prosecute
12 any individual PAGA claims against Defendants.

13 2. This Complaint challenges Defendants’ systemic illegal employment
14 practices resulting in violations of the stated provisions of the Labor Code against the identified
15 group of employees.

16 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges Defendants jointly
17 and severally acted intentionally and with deliberate indifference and conscious disregard to the
18 rights of all employees in: (a) failing to properly calculate and pay all minimum and overtime
19 wages; (b) failing to pay all meal period wages and rest break wages; (c) failing to provide
20 accurate wage statements; (d) failing to pay all wages due and owing during employment and
21 upon termination of employment; and (e) failing to reimburse all necessary business expenses.

22 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

23 4. This action is brought pursuant to PAGA, which deputizes any aggrieved
24 employee to prosecute Labor Code violations as a proxy, or “private attorney general,” of the
25 State of California. The civil penalties sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits
26 of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

27 ///

28 ///

1 5. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Constitution,
2 Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except
3 those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not
4 specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

5 6. This Court has jurisdiction over the violations of PAGA and Labor Code
6 sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551,
7 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802.

8 7. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information
9 and belief, each party has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally
10 avails itself of California law so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the courts
11 consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

12 8. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, the
13 named Defendants transact business and/or have offices in the State of California, including the
14 County of Ventura. The majority of the acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiff took
15 place in the State of California, County of Ventura. Defendants employed Plaintiff within the
16 State of California, County of Ventura. Moreover, this action is brought on behalf of the State of
17 California as a private attorney general and has jurisdiction in this venue.

18 **PARTIES**

19 9. Plaintiff Wardlaw is an individual residing in the State of California,
20 County of Ventura. Plaintiff was formerly employed by Defendants. Plaintiff Chase is an
21 individual residing in the State of California, County of Ventura. Plaintiff was formerly employed
22 by Defendants.

23 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants are
24 licensed to do business and actually doing business in the State of California, including the County
25 of Ventura.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

11. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and for that reason, said Defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff prays for leave to amend this complaint when the true names and capacities are known. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of Defendants designated as a DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

12. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators, and assigns, and that all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization, and consent of each Defendant designated herein.

13. Based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants are subject to PAGA and Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802.

CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Labor Code § 2698, et seq. (“PAGA”))

(Against DIOJI, INC. DBA DIOJI K-9 RESORT & ATHLETIC CLUB and DOES 1 through 100)

14. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 13, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

/ / /

/ / /

1 15. PAGA expressly establishes that any provision of the Labor Code which
2 provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the California Labor and Workforce
3 Development Agency (“LWDA”), or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
4 agencies or employees for a violation of the Labor Code, may be recovered through a civil action
5 brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of other current or former employees.

6 16. On May 13, 2024, Plaintiff Wardlaw provided written notice to the LWDA
7 and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that were violated, and the theories
8 supporting the contentions. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** and incorporated by reference is a copy
9 of the written notice to the LWDA. On October 17, 2024, Plaintiff Wardlaw provided an amended
10 written notice to the LWDA and Defendants that added Plaintiff Chase as a named representative.
11 Attached hereto as **Exhibit 2** and incorporated by reference is a copy of the amended written
12 notice to the LWDA. Plaintiff believes that on or about December 23, 2024, the sixty-five (65)
13 days’ notice period expired as to all Defendants, and the LWDA did not take any action to
14 investigate or prosecute this matter. Therefore, Plaintiff exhausted her administrative remedies.

15 17. Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are
16 “aggrieved employees” as defined by Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they all current and
17 former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant within the State of
18 California at any time during the period from February 15, 2024, through February 4, 2026 or the
19 date that the Court approves the PAGA settlement, whichever date is earlier, and one or more of
20 the alleged violations was committed against them.

21 **Failure to Pay Minimum and Overtime Wages**

22 18. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to compensate their
23 non-exempt employees minimum wages for all hours worked and overtime wages for all hours
24 worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a workweek, pursuant to the
25 mandate of Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198.

26 19. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to compensate aggrieved
27 current and former employees for all hours worked, resulting in a failure to pay all minimum
28 wages and overtime wages, where applicable.

1 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Rest Breaks**

2 20. In accordance with the mandates of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512,
3 Defendants were required to authorize and permit their non-exempt employees to take a
4 10-minute rest break for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof, and were further
5 required to provide their non-exempt employees with a 30-minute meal period for every five (5)
6 hours worked.

7 21. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide aggrieved current
8 and former employees with legally mandated meal periods and rest breaks and failed to pay proper
9 compensation for this failure.

10 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment**

11 22. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their
12 employees within a specified time period pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code section 204.

13 23. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to pay aggrieved current and
14 former employees all wages due and owing them within the required time period.

15 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination**

16 24. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their
17 employees all wages owed in a timely fashion at the end of employment pursuant to Labor Code
18 sections 201 to 204.

19 25. As a result of Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged above,
20 Defendants failed to pay aggrieved former employees their final wages pursuant to Labor Code
21 sections 201 to 204 and accordingly owe waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
22 203.

23 **Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements**

24 26. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to keep *accurate*
25 records regarding their California employees pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code sections 226
26 and 1174.

27 ///

28 ///

1 27. As a result of Defendants' various Labor Code violations, Defendants
2 failed to keep accurate records regarding aggrieved current and former employees. For example,
3 Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep accurate records regarding aggrieved
4 current and former employees' gross wages earned, total hours worked, all deductions, net wages
5 earned, and all applicable hourly rates and the number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

6 **Failure to Provide and Properly Pay Paid Sick Days**

7 28. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to provide their
8 employees with paid sick days at their regular rate of pay pursuant to Labor Code section 246, *et*
9 *seq.*

10 29. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other
11 aggrieved current and former employees with paid sick days at the proper rate of pay pursuant to
12 Labor Code section 246, *et seq.*

13 **Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses**

14 30. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to reimburse its
15 employees for any and all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employees in direct
16 consequences of the discharge or his or her duties pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code sections
17 2800 and 2802.

18 31. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to pay aggrieved current and
19 former employees all business expenses incurred and owing them within the required time period.

20 **Penalties**

21 32. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, Plaintiff, on behalf of current and
22 former aggrieved employees of Defendants and exclusively as a proxy of the State of California,
23 requests and is entitled to recover from Defendants, and each of them, civil penalties, interest,
24 attorneys' fees and costs pursuant, including but not limited to:

- 25 a. Penalties under Labor Code section 2699 in the amount of one hundred
26 dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial
27 violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per
28 pay period for each subsequent violation;

- b. Penalties under Code of Regulations Title 8 section 11040 in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- c. Penalties under Labor Code section 210 in addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the Labor Code in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- d. Penalties under Labor Code section 1197.1 in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- e. Any and all additional penalties as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes; and
- f. Attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 1194, and 2699, and any other applicable statute.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, exclusively as a representative of current and former aggrieved employees and as a proxy of the State of California pursuant to PAGA, prays for judgment as follows:

1. Upon the Cause of Action, for civil penalties pursuant to statute as set forth in Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*, for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802;
2. Upon the Cause of Action, for costs and attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 218.5, 1194, and 2699, and any other applicable statute; and

///

3. For such other and further relief the court may deem just and proper.

Dated: November 21, 2025

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

By: 
Douglas Han
Shunt Tatavos-Gharajeh
Jamie Nyugen
Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT 1

May 13, 2024

BY U.S. MAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov
State of California
Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Scout Wardlaw against Dioji, Inc. DBA Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer or managing agent acting on behalf of an "Employer" pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 1-20¹ for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter referred to as "Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club").

Mr. Wardlaw is pursuing his California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") claim on a representative basis. Therefore, Mr. Wardlaw may seek penalties for violations of the Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and aggrieved employees, which are recoverable under PAGA. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club is a California corporation located at 7340 Hollister Ave, Goleta, CA 93117.

Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club employed Mr. Wardlaw as an hourly-paid non-exempt Dog Associate, Bather, and Front Supervisor within one year of the date of this letter (until in or around September of 2023) in the State of California. Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club directly controls the wages, hours and/or working conditions of Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees' employment, including direction, retention, scheduling, supervision, and termination.

¹ Mr. Wardlaw does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and for that reason, said DOES are designated under such fictitious names. Mr. Wardlaw will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Mr. Wardlaw is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Mr. Wardlaw and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

The “aggrieved employees” that Mr. Wardlaw may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through a staffing agency) of Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club.

Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to properly pay its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees for all hours worked, failed to properly compensate minimum and overtime wages, failed to properly provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks or pay premium wages in lieu thereof, failed to issue compliant wage statements, and failed to reimburse for all necessary business-related costs and expenses, thus resulting in Labor Code violations as stated below.

Pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751, an employee who brings a representative action and was affected by at least one of the violations alleged in the complaint has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state not only for that violation, but for violations affecting other employees as well. Accordingly, Mr. Wardlaw has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all aggrieved employees at Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club, regardless of their classification, job title, location, or whether they were hired directly or through a staffing agency.

Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 require employers to pay time-and-a-half or double-time overtime wages and make it unlawful to work employees for hours longer than eight hours in one day and/or over forty hours in one week without paying the premium overtime rates. During the relevant time period, Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to compensate Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks. Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses into aggrieved employees’ regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all overtime hours worked.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 246 requires that employers provide employees with paid sick leave of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked. California Labor Code section 246(l) also requires that paid sick leave be paid at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to pay aggrieved employees paid sick leave that complied with California Labor Code section 246, by, for example, failing to pay paid sick leave at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a meal or rest break is not provided. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club routinely required Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club's policies and expectations and prepare orders. Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to provide coverage to Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees so they may be relieved of all work duties and take legally mandated meal and rest breaks. Lastly, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to authorize and permit aggrieved employees to take the requisite number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length. Despite these facts, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to compensate Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed, including failing to pay premium wages at aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay.

California Labor Code section 551 states "[e]very person employed in any occupation of labor is entitled to one day's rest therefrom in seven." Section 552 further states "[n]o employer of labor shall cause his employees to work more than six days in seven." Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club required aggrieved employees to work seven days in a row or more without one day's rest.

California Labor Code section 432.5 states "[n]o employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof, shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof to be prohibited by law." Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club required aggrieved employees to execute arbitration agreements as a condition of employment despite knowing that such agreements are prohibited under Labor Code section 432.6.

California Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits their employment, their wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours' previous notice of their intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to their wages at the time of quitting. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to pay Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees all wages, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 and therefore is liable under California Labor Code sections 203 and 210.

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to pay Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204, and is therefore liable under California Labor Code section 210.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club did not provide Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross wages earned by Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by aggrieved employees, (4) all deductions for Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved employee and only the last four digits of their 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 aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code section 558 allows recovery of penalties. Pursuant to the code, (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee. Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees have been denied their wages and premium wages and, therefore, are entitled to penalties.

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid to Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees.

///

///

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club did not provide Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of their job duties or in direct consequence of their obedience to the directions of the employer. During their employment, Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club, including for using their personal cellular phones and vehicles for work purposes.

We believe that Mr. Wardlaw and other current and former California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are entitled to penalties as allowed under California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter to the employer in question and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency setting forth the claims, and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this letter is to satisfy the requirement created by California Labor Code section 2699 prior to seeking penalties allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations. We look forward to determining whether the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly request that you respond to this notice according to the time frame contemplated by the California Labor Code.

Mr. Wardlaw will seek these penalties on his own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

///

///

LWDA
May 13, 2024
Page 7 of 7

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter and the noble cause you advance each and every day.

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Han', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Douglas Han, Esq.

CC: (By Certified U.S. Mail Only):

Bryce Wendel
c/o Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club
7340 Hollister Ave
Goleta, CA 93117
Agent for Service of Process for Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club

Legal Department
c/o Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club
315 Meigs Rd, Suite A #651
Santa Barbara, CA 93109

EXHIBIT 2

October 17, 2024

BY U.S. EMAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov
State of California
Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: Dioji, Inc., dba Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club
LWDA Case No. LWDA-CM-1028083-24

Dear Representative:

We hereby amend our May 13, 2024 letter sent to your office in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3. A true and correct copy of the May 13, 2024 letter is attached to this submission as **Exhibit A** for reference. We are amending this notice to add Mackenzie Chase as an aggrieved employee of Dioji, Inc., dba Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club. Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase are pursuing a California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”)) claim against their former employer on a representative basis.

We have been retained to represent Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase against Dioji, Inc., dba Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer and managing agent, DOES 1-10 as an “Employer” or person acting on behalf of an “Employer” pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 11-20¹ for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club”).

Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase are pursuing their California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”) claims on a representative basis. Therefore, Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase may seek penalties for violations of the Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and aggrieved employees, which are recoverable under PAGA. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Dioji, Inc., dba Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club is a California corporation located at 7340 Hollister Ave, Goleta, CA 93117.

///

///

¹ Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase do not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and for that reason, said DOES are designated under such fictitious names. Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase are informed and believe that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club employed Mr. Wardlaw as an hourly-paid non-exempt Dog Associate, Bather, and Front Supervisor within one year of the date of the original letter (until around September of 2023) in the State of California. Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club employed Ms. Chase as an hourly-paid non-exempt employee within one year of the date of the original letter (until around September of 2024) in the State of California. Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club directly controlled the wages, hours and/or working conditions of Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees' employment, including direction, retention, scheduling, supervision, and termination.

The "aggrieved employees" on whose behalf Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase may seek penalties are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through a staffing agency) of Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club within the State of California.

Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to properly pay its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees for all hours worked, failed to properly provide or compensate minimum and overtime wages and for meal and rest breaks, failed to issue compliant wage statements and failed to reimburse for all necessary business-related costs and expenses, thus resulting in other Labor Code violations as stated below.

Pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services*, 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751 (2018), an employee who brings a representative action and was affected by at least one of the violations alleged in the complaint has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state not only for that violation, but for violations affecting other employees as well. Accordingly, Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase have standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all the aggrieved employees at Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club, regardless of their classification, job title, location, or whether they were hired directly or through a staffing agency.

Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 require employers to pay at least minimum wage for all hours worked, pay time-and-a-half, or double-time overtime wages, and make it unlawful to work employees for hours longer than eight hours in one day and/or over forty hours in one week without paying the premium overtime rates. During the relevant time period, Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to compensate Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks. Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses and incentives in Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all overtime hours worked.

///

California Labor Code section 246 requires that employers provide employees with paid sick leave of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked. California Labor Code section 246(l) also requires that paid sick leave be paid at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to pay Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees with paid sick leave that complied with California Labor Code section 246, by, for example, failing to pay paid sick leave at non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a meal or rest break is not provided. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club routinely required Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club's policies and expectations. Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to provide coverage to Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees so they may be relieved of all work duties and take legally mandated meal and rest breaks. Moreover, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club also failed to authorize and permit Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees to take the requisite number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length. Despite these facts, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to compensate Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed, including failing to pay premium wages at Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay.

California Labor Code section 551 states "[e]very person employed in any occupation of labor is entitled to one day's rest therefrom in seven." Section 552 further states "[n]o employer of labor shall cause his employees to work more than six days in seven." Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club required aggrieved employees to work seven days in a row or more without one day's rest.

California Labor Code section 432.5 states "[n]o employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof, shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof to be prohibited by law." Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club required aggrieved employees to execute arbitration agreements as a condition of employment despite knowing that such agreements are prohibited under Labor Code section 432.6.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 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. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to pay Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees all wages, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 203 and therefore is liable under California Labor Code section 203.

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to pay Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204.

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club did not provide Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross wages earned by Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees (4) all deductions for Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved employee and only 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 Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code section 558 allows recovery of penalties. (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee. Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees have been denied their wages and premium wages and, therefore, are entitled to penalties.

California Labor Code sections 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than two years. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid, to Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club did not provide Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. During their employment, Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club, including for purchasing tools and equipment they were required to use and wear while working.

We believe that Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase and other current and former California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are entitled to penalties as allowed under California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter to the employer in questions and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency setting forth the claims, and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

///

LWDA
October 17, 2024
Page 6 of 6

The purpose of this letter is to satisfy the requirement created by California Labor code section 2699 prior to seeking penalties allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations. We look forward to determining whether California Labor & Workforce Development Agency intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly request that you respond to this notice according to the time frame contemplated by the California Labor Code.

Mr. Wardlaw and Ms. Chase will seek these penalties on their own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club within one year of the date of the original May 13, 2024 letter, as allowed by law.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter and the noble cause you advance each and every day.

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Han", written over a horizontal line.

Douglas Han, Esq.

CC: (By Certified U.S. Mail Only):

Legal Department
c/o Dioji, Inc.
7340 Hollister Ave
Goleta, CA 93117
Agent for Service of Process for Dioji, Inc.

Legal Department
c/o Dioji, Inc.
315 Meigs Rd, Suite A #651
Santa Barbara, CA 93109

EXHIBIT A

May 13, 2024

BY U.S. MAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov
State of California
Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Scout Wardlaw against Dioji, Inc. DBA Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer or managing agent acting on behalf of an "Employer" pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 1-20¹ for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter referred to as "Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club").

Mr. Wardlaw is pursuing his California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") claim on a representative basis. Therefore, Mr. Wardlaw may seek penalties for violations of the Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and aggrieved employees, which are recoverable under PAGA. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club is a California corporation located at 7340 Hollister Ave, Goleta, CA 93117.

Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club employed Mr. Wardlaw as an hourly-paid non-exempt Dog Associate, Bather, and Front Supervisor within one year of the date of this letter (until in or around September of 2023) in the State of California. Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club directly controls the wages, hours and/or working conditions of Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees' employment, including direction, retention, scheduling, supervision, and termination.

¹ Mr. Wardlaw does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and for that reason, said DOES are designated under such fictitious names. Mr. Wardlaw will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Mr. Wardlaw is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Mr. Wardlaw and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

The “aggrieved employees” that Mr. Wardlaw may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through a staffing agency) of Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club.

Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to properly pay its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees for all hours worked, failed to properly compensate minimum and overtime wages, failed to properly provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks or pay premium wages in lieu thereof, failed to issue compliant wage statements, and failed to reimburse for all necessary business-related costs and expenses, thus resulting in Labor Code violations as stated below.

Pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751, an employee who brings a representative action and was affected by at least one of the violations alleged in the complaint has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state not only for that violation, but for violations affecting other employees as well. Accordingly, Mr. Wardlaw has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all aggrieved employees at Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club, regardless of their classification, job title, location, or whether they were hired directly or through a staffing agency.

Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 require employers to pay time-and-a-half or double-time overtime wages and make it unlawful to work employees for hours longer than eight hours in one day and/or over forty hours in one week without paying the premium overtime rates. During the relevant time period, Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to compensate Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks. Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses into aggrieved employees’ regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all overtime hours worked.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 246 requires that employers provide employees with paid sick leave of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked. California Labor Code section 246(l) also requires that paid sick leave be paid at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to pay aggrieved employees paid sick leave that complied with California Labor Code section 246, by, for example, failing to pay paid sick leave at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a meal or rest break is not provided. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club routinely required Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club's policies and expectations and prepare orders. Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to provide coverage to Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees so they may be relieved of all work duties and take legally mandated meal and rest breaks. Lastly, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to authorize and permit aggrieved employees to take the requisite number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length. Despite these facts, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to compensate Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed, including failing to pay premium wages at aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay.

California Labor Code section 551 states "[e]very person employed in any occupation of labor is entitled to one day's rest therefrom in seven." Section 552 further states "[n]o employer of labor shall cause his employees to work more than six days in seven." Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club required aggrieved employees to work seven days in a row or more without one day's rest.

California Labor Code section 432.5 states "[n]o employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof, shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof to be prohibited by law." Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club required aggrieved employees to execute arbitration agreements as a condition of employment despite knowing that such agreements are prohibited under Labor Code section 432.6.

California Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits their employment, their wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours' previous notice of their intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to their wages at the time of quitting. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to pay Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees all wages, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 and therefore is liable under California Labor Code sections 203 and 210.

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to pay Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204, and is therefore liable under California Labor Code section 210.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club did not provide Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross wages earned by Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by aggrieved employees, (4) all deductions for Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved employee and only the last four digits of their 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 aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code section 558 allows recovery of penalties. Pursuant to the code, (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee. Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees have been denied their wages and premium wages and, therefore, are entitled to penalties.

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid to Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees.

///

///

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club did not provide Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of their job duties or in direct consequence of their obedience to the directions of the employer. During their employment, Mr. Wardlaw and other aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club, including for using their personal cellular phones and vehicles for work purposes.

We believe that Mr. Wardlaw and other current and former California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are entitled to penalties as allowed under California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter to the employer in question and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency setting forth the claims, and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this letter is to satisfy the requirement created by California Labor Code section 2699 prior to seeking penalties allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations. We look forward to determining whether the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly request that you respond to this notice according to the time frame contemplated by the California Labor Code.

Mr. Wardlaw will seek these penalties on his own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

///

///

LWDA
May 13, 2024
Page 7 of 7

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter and the noble cause you advance each and every day.

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Han', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Douglas Han, Esq.

CC: (By Certified U.S. Mail Only):

Bryce Wendel
c/o Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club
7340 Hollister Ave
Goleta, CA 93117
Agent for Service of Process for Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club

Legal Department
c/o Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club
315 Meigs Rd, Suite A #651
Santa Barbara, CA 93109

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
1013A(3) CCP

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 751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101, Pasadena, California 91103.

On November 21, 2025, I served the foregoing document described as

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF
LABOR CODE § 2698, et seq. (PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004)**

on interested parties in this action by emailing a true and correct copy thereof to the email addresses as follows:

Rafael Gonzalez (RGonzalez@mullenlaw.com)
Christina M. Behrman (cbehrman@mullenlaw.com)
Brian T. Daly (bdaly@mullenlaw.com)
Jenna A. MacFarlane (jmacfarlane@mullenlaw.com)
Mullen Law e-Service (eservice@mullenlaw.com)

MULLEN & HENZELL L.L.P.

112 E. Victoria Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Attorney(s) for Defendant Dioji, Inc.


[X] BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE

The above-referenced document was transmitted to the addressee(s) at the e-mail addresses listed herein, which are their most recently known e-mail addresses or e-mail addresses of record in this action. I did not receive, within reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

[X] STATE

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on November 21, 2025, at Pasadena, California.



Christina Castro

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
1013A(3) CCP

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 751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101, Pasadena, California 91103 and my electronic service address is ccastro@justicelawcorp.com.

On December 22, 2025, I served the foregoing document described as

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF
LABOR CODE § 2698, et seq. (PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004)**

for the following case: **Wardlaw v. Dioji K-9 Resort & Athletic Club**
LWDA/Court Case No.: **LWDA Case No.: 1028083-24**
 Court Case No.: 2024CUOE028009
 Ventura County Superior Court

on interested parties in this action by electronically submitting as follows:

State of California
Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55
Sacramento, California 95814

[X] BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

Pursuant to California Senate Bill No. 836, I caused the documents described above to be electronically submitted by and through the procedure stated on the website of the State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

[X] STATE

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on December 22, 2025, at Pasadena, California.



Christina Castro