

Seung L. Yang (SBN 249857)
E-mail: seung.yang@thesentinel-firm.com
Tiffany Hyun (SBN 311743)
E-mail: tiffany.hyun@thesentinel-firm.com
THE SENTINEL FIRM, APC
355 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 1450
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 985-1150
Facsimile: (213) 985-2155

Attorneys for Plaintiffs William Leon and
Jeffrey K. Daniel

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
08/08/2024

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
By: R. Lozano Deputy

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

WILLIAM LEON, individually, and on behalf of
all others similarly situated, and on behalf of
other aggrieved employees pursuant to the
California Private Attorneys General Act;
JEFFREY K. DANIEL, individually, and on
behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to
the California Private Attorneys General Act;

Plaintiffs,

vs.

TRI-WEST, LTD., a corporation; and DOES 1
through 10, inclusive,

Defendants

Case No.: 24STCV13577

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

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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiffs William Leon and Jeffrey K Daniel (“Plaintiffs”), based upon facts that either
2 have evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable
3 opportunity for further investigation and discovery, allege as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiffs brings this action against Defendant Tri-West, LTD., and Does 1 through
6 10 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor Code violations and unfair
7 business practices stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay
8 overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods,
9 failure to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failure to timely pay all
10 wages to terminated employees, failure to indemnify necessary business expenses, and failure to
11 furnish accurate wage statements.

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

18 3. Plaintiffs Leon and Daniel brings the Ninth Cause of Action as a representative
19 action under the California Private Attorney General Act (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties
20 that are owed to Plaintiffs, the State of California, and past and present non-exempt, hourly-paid
21 employees of Defendants who worked in California during the applicable statute of limitations
22 period (hereinafter referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”).

23 4. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
24 establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. As such, and based
25 upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants’ business in California, Defendants
26 are subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare
27 Commission (“IWC”), and the California Business & Professions Code.



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

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

24 6. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and
25 constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their
26 unlawful policies. Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein
27 were willful and deliberate.
28



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

THE PARTIES

Plaintiff

8. Plaintiff Leon is a California resident that worked for Defendants in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, as a Warehouse Lead since approximately March 2016.

9. Plaintiff Daniel is a California resident that worked for Defendants in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, as a Warehouse Lead since approximately December 2017.

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

Defendants

11. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendant Tri-West, LTD. is:

- (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in Los Angeles, California;
- (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Los Angeles; and
- (c) The employer of Plaintiffs, and the current and/or former employer of the putative Class. Defendant suffered and permitted Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

12. Plaintiffs do not currently know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the



1 damages suffered by Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein.
2 Plaintiffs will amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these
3 Defendants when they have been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as
4 may be necessary.

5 13. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and
6 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of,
7 and/or injured a significant number of the Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in
8 the State of California.

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

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

23 15. Plaintiffs Leon and Daniel are California residents who worked for Defendants in
24 the County of Los Angeles, State of California, as Warehouse Leads during the statutory period.
25 Plaintiffs were typically scheduled to work 5 days in a workweek, and typically in excess of 8
26 hours in a single workday.

27 16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs for all hours
28 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiffs with

1 uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs to take uninterrupted rest
2 periods, failed to indemnify Plaintiffs for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all
3 final wages to Plaintiffs when Defendants terminated Plaintiffs' employment, and failed to
4 furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiffs. As discussed below, Plaintiffs' experience
5 working for Defendants was typical and illustrative.

6 17. Throughout the statutory period, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
7 Employees worked more than 8 hours in a workday and more than 40 hours in a workweek.
8 Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
9 Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime wages. In those instances where
10 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees earned non-discretionary bonuses and other
11 remuneration, Defendants failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the correct
12 overtime rate of pay, meal break premium rate of pay, rest break premium rate of pay, and sick
13 day rate of pay. Also throughout the statutory period, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
14 Employees were required to work "off-the-clock" and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiffs,
15 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were required to wait in line for several minutes in order
16 to clock in and out for their shifts and meal periods without compensation. Plaintiffs, the Class,
17 and the Aggrieved Employees were also required perform work tasks such as unloading trucks
18 and trailers during meal periods and after clocking out of their shifts, but were not compensated
19 for this additional time worked. In maintaining a practice of not paying all wages owed,
20 Defendants failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff, the Class, and the
21 Aggrieved Employees worked.

22 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to provide
23 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods.
24 Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
25 Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing 30-minute,
26 continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without
27 compensating Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not
28 provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not



1 adequately inform Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal
2 period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the
3 tenth hour of work. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes required
4 to work during their meal periods, leading to the failure to provide uninterrupted meal periods.
5 For example, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were required to help unload
6 and load trucks and trailers during meal periods, resulting in shortened and interrupted meal
7 periods. Additionally, for shifts that were 13-hours in length, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
8 Aggrieved Employees were not provided with second meal periods. Accordingly, Defendants'
9 policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
10 Employees in compliance with California law.

11 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
12 and permit Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest
13 periods. Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
14 Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing
15 and permitting them to take a net 10-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every
16 four hours of work (or major fraction thereof), or without compensating Plaintiffs, the Class, and
17 the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendants also
18 did not adequately inform Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to
19 take a rest period. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting
20 or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did
21 Defendants have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendants
22 also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
23 Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendants did not
24 maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendants cannot
25 demonstrate that Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the
26 middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not authorize
27 and permit Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance
28 with California law.



1 20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiffs, the
2 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of
3 their duties for Defendants without reimbursement. For example, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
4 Aggrieved Employees were required to use their personal cell phones for work purposes such as
5 answering work-related phone calls from supervisors and co-workers, sending/receiving emails,
6 and clocking in/out for their shifts. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were not
7 compensated for these work-related expenses.

8 21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
9 pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at the conclusion of their employment all
10 wages for all minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period
11 premium wages. Further, Defendants did not pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
12 Employees their final paychecks immediately upon termination.

13 22. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiffs, the Class,
14 and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable
15 hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages
16 earned for hours worked, correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that
17 were not provided in accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were
18 not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and Defendant's
19 address). As a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiffs, the
20 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

- 21 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
22 minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest
23 period premium wages to which they were entitled, even though they were
24 entitled;
- 25 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum,
26 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even
27 though they had not been;
- 28

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

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

23 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

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

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

1 25. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

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

5 26. At all material times, Plaintiff Leon was a member of the Class.

6 27. Plaintiff Leon undertakes this concerted activity to improve the wages and
7 working conditions of all Class Members.

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

- 10 (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so
11 numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical.
12 The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff Leon at this
13 time, however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals and
14 the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of
15 Defendants' records.
- 16 (b) Typicality: Plaintiff Leon is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately
17 protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared,
18 well-defined community of interest, and Plaintiff Leon's claims (or
19 defenses, if any) are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated
20 herein.
- 21 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff Leon is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately
22 protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared,
23 well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as
24 demonstrated herein. Plaintiff Leon has no conflicts with or interests
25 antagonistic to any Class Member. Plaintiff Leon's attorneys, the proposed
26 class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery,
27 certification, and settlement. Plaintiff Leon has incurred, and throughout
28 the duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees



that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

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

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

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

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

- (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum wages, and overtime wages;

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

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

- (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any question affecting only individual members;
- (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the class before the Court;
- (d) Plaintiff Leon, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a class action;
- (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries for which Defendants are responsible in an amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the Class for the injuries sustained;



- 1 (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by
2 individual members of the class would create a risk of:
- 3 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
4 members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards
5 of conduct for Defendants; and/or
- 6 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would,
7 as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other
8 members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially
9 impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including but
10 not limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from
11 those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,
- 12 (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
13 the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to
14 the class as a whole.

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

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

25 32. Plaintiff Leon incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
26 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

27

28



1 33. “Hours worked” is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of
2 an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or
3 not required to do so.

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

9 35. Accordingly, Plaintiff Leon and the Class are entitled to recover minimum wages
10 for all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

11 36. By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiff Leon and the Class have
12 been deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned by virtue of their employment with
13 Defendants.

14 37. By virtue of the Defendants’ unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to
15 Plaintiff Leon and the Class for their non-overtime hours worked without pay, Plaintiff Leon and
16 the Class suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently
17 unknown to Plaintiff Leon and the Class, but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this
18 Court, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

19 38. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code §
20 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage
21 compensation due Plaintiff Leon and the Class.

22 39. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff Leon and the Class are
23 entitled to recover liquidated damages (double damages) for Defendants’ failure to pay
24 minimum wages.

25 40. California Labor Code section 204 requires employers to provide employees with
26 all wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period
27 applicable to this cause of action, Plaintiff Leon and the Class were entitled to be paid twice a
28 month at rates required by law, including minimum wages. However, during all such times,



1 Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay Plaintiff Leon and the Class all such wages
2 due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month.

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

6 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)**

8 42. Plaintiff Leon incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
9 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

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

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

18 45. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff Leon and the Class have worked more than
19 eight hours in a workday, as employees of Defendants.

20 46. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff Leon and the Class
21 overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the maximum hours
22 permissible by law as required by California Labor Code § 510 and 1198. Plaintiff Leon and the
23 Class are regularly required to work overtime hours.

24 47. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional premium rate
25 compensation to the Plaintiff Leon and the Class for their overtime hours worked, Plaintiff Leon
26 and the Class have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently
27 unknown to them but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court and which will be
28 ascertained according to proof at trial.



1 48. By failing to keep adequate time records required by Labor Code § 1174(d),
2 Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation due to
3 Plaintiff Leon and the Class.

4 49. Plaintiff Leon and the Class also request recovery of overtime compensation
5 according to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code §
6 1194(a), as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in a sum as
7 provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

8 50. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all
9 wages due and payable twice a month. The Wage Orders also provide that every employer shall
10 pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime wages for all
11 overtime hours worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Leon and
12 the Class with all compensation due, in violation of California Labor Code § 204.

13 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

15 51. Plaintiff Leon incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
16 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

17 52. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the
18 Plaintiff Leon and the Class of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than
19 the start of Plaintiff Leon and the Class' sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their
20 second meal periods no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Section
21 512 of the California Labor Code, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an
22 employer provide unpaid meal periods of at least 30 minutes for each five-hour period worked.
23 It is a violation of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code for an employer to require any
24 employee to work during any meal period mandated under any Wage Order.

25 53. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiff
26 Leon and the Class with both meal periods as required by California law. By their failure to
27 permit and authorize Plaintiff Leon and the Class to take all meal periods as alleged above (or
28 due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted



meal periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code and the applicable Wage Orders.

54. Under California law, Plaintiff Leon and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages at the regular rate of pay for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s), plus interest thereon.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

55. Plaintiff Leon incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

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

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

58. Under California law, Plaintiff Leon and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages at the regular rate of pay for each workday he or she was not provided with all required rest break(s), plus interest thereon.

1 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

3 59. Plaintiff Leon incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
4 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

5 60. Defendants violated Labor Code section 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, by
6 failing to pay and indemnify the Plaintiff and the Class for their necessary expenditures and
7 losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to
8 directions of Defendants.

9 61. As a result, Plaintiff Leon and the Class were damaged at least in the amounts of
10 the expenses they paid, or which were deducted by Defendants from their wages.

11 62. Plaintiff Leon and the class they represent are entitled to attorney's fees, expenses,
12 and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(c) and interest pursuant to Labor Code
13 section 2802(b).

14 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

17 63. Plaintiff Leon incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
18 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

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

25 65. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff Leon and
26 many other members of the Class ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the
27 employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and
28 continue to fail to pay terminated Class Members, without abatement, all wages required to be



1 paid by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within
2 seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

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

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

11 68. Plaintiff Leon and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their
12 additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay,
13 up to 30 days maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

14 69. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, Plaintiff Leon and
15 the Class are also entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs
16 incurred in this action.

17 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and** 19 **Compliant Wage Records)**

20 70. Plaintiff Leon incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
21 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

22 71. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that
23 every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement
24 in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours
25 worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate
26 if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions
27 made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net
28 wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name



1 of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee
2 identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal
3 entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
4 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

5 72. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with
6 complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the
7 failure to correctly identify the gross wages earned by Plaintiff and the Class, the failure to list
8 the true “total hours worked by the employee,” and the failure to list the true net wages earned.

9 73. As a result of Defendants’ violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff
10 Leon and the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

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

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

20 76. Plaintiff Leon and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their actual
21 damages caused by Defendants’ failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a).

22 77. Plaintiff Leon and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief, as well as an
23 award of attorney’s fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California
24 Labor Code § 226(h).

25 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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



1 unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

2 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

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

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

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

10 **Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses**

11 88. Defendants' failure to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses in
12 accordance with California Labor Code § 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above,
13 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§
14 17200, *et seq.*

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

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

19 90. By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices
20 described herein, the Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from
21 Plaintiff Leon, and all persons similarly situated, and have deprived Plaintiff Leon, and all
22 persons similarly situated, of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their
23 detriment.

24 91. Plaintiff Leon and the Class Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result
25 of Defendants' wrongful conduct.

26 92. Plaintiff Leon, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, is
27 entitled to, and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property
28 which the Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiff Leon and the Class have



1 been deprived, by means of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
2 practices. Plaintiff Leon and the Class are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the
3 wrongful practices of Defendants in order to recover restitution.

4 93. Plaintiff Leon, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, are
5 further entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are
6 unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of
7 them, from engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
8 practices in the future.

9 94. Plaintiff Leon, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, have
10 no plain, speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members
11 suffered as a consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
12 practices. As a result of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described
13 above, Plaintiff Leon, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, has suffered
14 and will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are
15 restrained from continuing to engage in said unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
16 practices.

17 95. Plaintiff Leon also alleges that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set
18 forth herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other
19 withholdings.

20 96. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiff
21 Leon and putative Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained
22 by Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a
23 permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff Leon
24 and Class Members; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure
25 § 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

26 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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



1 97. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
2 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

3 98. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the
4 State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

5 99. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action
6 to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “Notwithstanding any other provision of
7 law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by
8 the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions,
9 commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative,
10 be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or
11 herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section
12 2699.3.”

13 100. Plaintiffs have exhausted their administrative remedies pursuant to California
14 Labor Code § 2699.3. On June 3, 2024, Plaintiffs Leon and Daniel gave written notice by online
15 filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of
16 the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiffs and
17 certain current and former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support the
18 violations. Plaintiffs also paid the filing fee. Plaintiff Leon’s PAGA case number is LWDA-
19 CM-1031698-24. Plaintiff Daniel’s PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-1031761-24.

20 101. More than 65 days has elapsed since Plaintiffs provided notice, but the Labor and
21 Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’
22 Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiffs may commence a civil
23 action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of
24 the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to,
25 penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, and 2699(f)(2).

26 102. In addition, Plaintiffs seeks penalties for Defendants’ violation of California Labor
27 Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity,
28 employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by



1 California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable
2 IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee
3 begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall also be
4 recorded. Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every employer shall
5 keep total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

6 103. During the time period of employment for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved
7 Employees, Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the Labor Code and IWC Orders
8 by failing to maintain accurate records showing meal periods. Defendants' failure to provide
9 and maintain records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiffs and the
10 Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency
11 of meal periods. Therefore, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the
12 resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to
13 Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and
14 continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest
15 on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully
16 perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to
17 proof at trial. Because of Defendants' knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and
18 applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an
19 injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage
20 payments paid to them.

21 104. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiffs are entitled to an
22 award of civil penalties on behalf of himself, the State of California, and similarly Aggrieved
23 Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount
24 to be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies
25 permitted by law.

26 105. In addition, Plaintiffs seek an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs
27 pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in
28 any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

5 **Class Certification**

- 6 1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second,
7 Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action;
8 2. That Plaintiff Leon be appointed as the representative of the Class; and
9 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

10 **As to the First Cause of Action**

- 11 4. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
12 Labor Code §§ 204 and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all
13 minimum wages due;
14 5. For general unpaid wages as may be appropriate;
15 6. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
16 such amounts were due;
17 7. For liquidated damages;
18 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
19 California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,
20 9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

21 **As to the Second Cause of Action**

- 22 10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
23 Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all
24 overtime wages due;
25 11. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;
26 12. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing
27 from the date such amounts were due;
28 13. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to



1 California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,

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

3 As to the Third Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

12 As to the Fourth Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

21 As to the Fifth Cause of Action

22 25. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §
23 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders;

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

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

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



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

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

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

As to all Causes of Action

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

Dated: August 8, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

THE SENTINEL FIRM, APC

By:



Seung L. Yang
Tiffany Hyun
Attorneys for Plaintiff



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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

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

Dated: August 8, 2024

THE SENTINEL FIRM, APC

By: 
Seung L. Yang
Tiffany Hyun
Attorneys for Plaintiff

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
3)
4 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

5 I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not
6 a party to the within action; the address from which I served the document listed below is 355 S
Grand Ave, Suite 1450, Los Angeles, California 90071. On August 9, 2024, I served the
foregoing document described as:

7 **FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION**
8 **COMPLAINT:**

9
10 by placing ☐ (the original) ☒ (a true copy thereof) in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

- 11 ☒ **BY MAIL:** I placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary
12 business practices. I am readily familiar with the practice of The Sentinel Law Firm, APC's
13 practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that
correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course
of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully
prepaid.

14 **HILL, FARRER & BURRILL, LLP**

15 James A. Bowles, Esq. (jbowles@hillfarrer.com)
16 Richard S. Zuniga, Esq. (rzuniga@hillfarrer.com)
Elissa L. Gysi, Esq. (egysi@hillfarrer.com)

17 300 S. Grand Avenue, 37th Floor
18 Los Angeles, CA 90071-3147

- 19 ☐ **BY MAIL:** I deposited the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service, with the
postage fully prepaid at 445 S Figueroa Street, Suite 2230, Los Angeles, California 90071.
- 20 ☐ **BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY:** I placed the sealed envelope(s) or package(s)
21 designated by the express service carrier for collection and overnight delivery by following
the ordinary business practices of The Sentinel Law Firm, APC. I am readily familiar with
22 The Sentinel Law Firm, APC's practice for collecting and processing of correspondence
for overnight delivery, said practice being that, in the ordinary course of business,
23 correspondence for overnight delivery is deposited with delivery fees paid or provided for
at the carrier's express service offices for next-day delivery.
- 24 ☐ **BY MESSENGER SERVICE:** (1) For a party represented by an attorney, delivery was
25 made to the attorney or at the attorney's office by leaving the documents in an envelope or
package clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served with a receptionist or an
26 individual in charge of the office. (2) For a party, delivery was made to the party or by
leaving the documents at the party's residence with some person not less than 18 years of
27 age between the hours of eight in the morning and six in the evening.

☐ **BY EMAIL:** by transmitting a facsimile transmission a copy of said document(s) to the following email addressee(s), in accordance with:

☐ the written confirmation of counsel in this action:

☐ **BY CM/ECF:** With the Clerk of the United States District Court of California, using the CM/ECF System. The Court's CM/ECF System will send an e-mail notification of the foregoing filing to the parties and counsel of record who are registered with the Court's CM/ECF System.

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

Executed on August 9, 2024, at Los Angeles, California.

Karen Arellano

Name

Signature