

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.
William C. Sung, SB# 280792
E-Mail: william@justiceforworkers.com
Tiffany L. Luu, SB# 335127
E-Mail: tlou@justiceforworkers.com
9575 Bolsa Avenue
Westminster, CA 92683
Tel: 323-922-2000
Fax: 323-922-2000

Attorneys for Plaintiff CHINYERE EZEKWESILI

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
09/24/2024

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**

CHINYERE EZEKWESILI, an individual and
on behalf of all others similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

VERMONT HEALTHCARE CENTER, LLC,
a California limited liability company; and
DOES 1 through 50,

Defendants.

Case No.: 24STCV17871

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

- (1) **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 204, 510, 1194,
1198);**
- (2) **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512, 558);**
- (3) **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 516, 558);**
- (4) **WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES
(LABOR CODE § 226);**
- (5) **WAITING TIME PENALTIES
(LABOR CODE §§ 201-203);**
- (6) **UNFAIR COMPETITION (BUS &
PROF CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*); and**
- (7) **CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE
CALIFORNIA PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT
(LABOR CODE §§ 2698, *et seq.*)**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff CHINYERE EZEKWESILI (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself and all others
2 similarly situated, hereby brings this First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint
3 (“Complaint”) against Defendants VERMONT HEALTHCARE CENTER, LLC, a California
4 limited liability company, and DOES 1 to 50 (collectively “Defendants”), and on information and
5 belief alleges as follows:

6 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

7 1. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, hereby brings this
8 Complaint for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under California Business and Professions
9 Code § 17200, *et seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1198,
10 2698, *et seq.*, and Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order 5-2001 (“Wage Order 5”),
11 in addition to seeking injunctive relief, declaratory relief, and restitution. This Complaint is brought
12 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants’
13 violations of the Labor Code because the amount in controversy exceeds \$25,000.

14 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district because Defendants maintain offices, have
15 agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, including Los Angeles County, and some
16 of the acts and omissions complained of herein occurred in Los Angeles County. Furthermore,
17 Plaintiff was employed by Defendants within Los Angeles County.

18 **PARTIES**

19 3. Plaintiff is, and at all times relevant herein was, an individual over the age of
20 eighteen (18) and is a California resident. Within the statute of limitations periods applicable to
21 each cause of action pled herein, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee.
22 Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or customs complained of
23 herein and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed by Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et*
24 *seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1198, 2698, *et seq.*, and
25 Wage Order 5.

26 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the
27 applicable statute of limitations for each cause of action pled herein and continuing to the present,
28 Defendants engaged in, and continue to engage in, business, and employed Plaintiff and other,

1 similarly-situated non-exempt employees within Los Angeles County, and the State of California
2 and, therefore, were (and are) doing business in Los Angeles County and the State of California.

3 5. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or
4 corporate, of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 50, inclusive, and for that reason, said
5 defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to
6 amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed,
7 and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious defendants, whether individual,
8 partners, or corporate, was responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein,
9 and proximately caused Plaintiff and the Classes (as defined below) to be subject to the unlawful
10 employment practices, wrongs, injuries, and damages complained of herein.

11 6. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of
12 the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendant; and furthermore,
13 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each of the other
14 defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned, were acting
15 within the course and scope of said agency and employment.

16 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
17 material hereto, each of the Defendants named herein was the agent, employee, alter ego and/or
18 joint venturer of, or working in concert with each of the other co-Defendants and was acting within
19 the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity. To the extent
20 said acts, conduct, and omissions were perpetrated by certain Defendants, each of the remaining
21 Defendants confirmed and ratified said acts, conduct, and omissions of the acting Defendants.

22 8. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were members of, and
23 engaged in, a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course and
24 scope of, and in pursuance of, said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise.

25 9. At all times herein mentioned, the acts and omissions of various Defendants, and
26 each of them, concurred and contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and all of the
27 other Defendants in proximately causing the injuries and damages as herein alleged. \

28 ///

1 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

2 10. Defendants own and operate a hospital in Torrance, California. Defendants
3 employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately October 2023 to
4 approximately July 8, 2024 as a CNA.

5 11. Throughout Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Defendants' timekeeping
6 and/or payroll policies and practices resulted in Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees not being
7 compensated for all hours actually worked. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees regularly
8 worked more than eight hours in a workday or 40 hours in a workweek. Upon information and
9 belief, Defendants failed to properly calculate overtime hours based on the workday and workweek
10 and failed to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration, including
11 on-call incentives and shift differentials, into the regular rate of pay. As a result, Plaintiff and other
12 non-exempt employees were not compensated for all earned overtime wages.

13 12. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with all
14 legally compliant meal periods due to Defendants' meal period policies/practices, which have
15 frequently resulted in late (commencing after the fifth hour of work), short (less than 30 minutes),
16 and/or missed meal periods. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff and other non-exempt
17 employees were not able to take their legally compliant meal breaks due to work demands imposed
18 by Defendants. Upon information and belief, Defendants do not keep accurate records of Plaintiff's
19 and other non-exempt employees' hours worked, including accurate time records showing when
20 employees take their meal periods. On those occasions when Plaintiff and other non-exempt
21 employees were not provided with all legally compliant meal periods to which they were entitled,
22 Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with the required meal
23 period premium(s) for each workday there was a meal period violation as mandated by Labor Code
24 § 226.7. Furthermore, upon information and belief, Defendants failed to pay meal period premiums
25 at the regular rate of compensation and failed to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-
26 discretionary remuneration, including on-call incentives and shift differentials.

27 13. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not authorized and permitted to take
28 all required rest periods due to Defendants' unlawful rest period policies/practices, which failed to

1 authorize and permit a net 10-minute rest period for every four hours worked, or major fraction
2 thereof. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not able to take their legally compliant rest
3 breaks due to work demands imposed by Defendants. Additionally, although Plaintiff and other
4 non-exempt employees occasionally worked shifts in excess of 14 hours, Plaintiff and other non-
5 exempt employees were not authorized and permitted a fourth rest period during shifts in excess of
6 10 hours. On those occasions when Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not authorized
7 and permitted to take all legally compliant rest periods to which they were entitled, Defendants
8 failed to compensate them with the required rest period premium(s) for each workday there was a
9 rest period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon information and belief, Defendants
10 maintained no mechanism for the payment of rest period premium payments as required by Labor
11 Code § 226.7, in the event that a legally compliant rest period was not authorized and permitted to
12 their non-exempt employees.

13 14. Additionally, upon information and belief, Defendants violated Labor Code § 246 by
14 failing to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration including on-
15 call incentives and shift differentials into the paid sick leave pay rate.

16 15. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay all overtime wages, failure to pay all meal
17 and rest period premium wages, and unlawful timekeeping and payroll practices as alleged above,
18 Defendants maintained inaccurate payroll records and issued inaccurate wage statements to Plaintiff
19 and other non-exempt employees. As a further result of Defendants' failure to pay all overtime
20 wages, sick leave wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, Defendants failed to timely pay
21 all final wages to Plaintiff and other former non-exempt employees upon their separation of
22 employment from Defendants.

23 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

24 16. **Class Definitions:** Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and the following
25 Classes pursuant to § 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure:

- 26 a. Overtime Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the
27 State of California who worked more than eight hours per day and/or 40 hours per
28 week and were subject to Defendants' timekeeping policies and/or practices, during

the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.

- b. Meal Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who: (i) worked at least one shift in excess of 5.0 hours; and/or (ii) worked at least one shift in excess of 10.0 hours, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- c. Rest Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who worked at least one shift of 3.5 or more hours, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- d. Wage Statement Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who received a wage statement, during the one year immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- e. Waiting Time Penalty Class: All of Defendants' formerly employed members of the Minimum Wage Class, Overtime Class, Rest Period Class, and/or Meal Period Class during the three years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.

17. **Numerosity/Ascertainability**: The members of the Classes are so numerous that joinder of all members would be impractical, if not impossible. The membership of the Classes is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, it is estimated that the members of the Classes number greater than 50 individuals. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants' employment records, including payroll records.

18. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well-Defined Community of Interest**: There are predominant common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and members of the Classes, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members including, without limitation to:

- a. Whether Defendants properly paid all overtime wages to members of the Overtime Class;
- b. Whether Defendants provided all legally compliant meal periods or paid meal period premium wages due to members of the Meal Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§

226.7 and 512;

- c. Whether Defendants authorized and permitted all legally compliant rest periods or paid all rest period premium wages due to members of the Rest Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;
- d. Whether Defendants furnished legally compliant wage statements to members of the Wage Statement Class pursuant to Labor Code § 226; and
- e. Whether Defendants timely paid all final wages to members of the Waiting Time Class at the time of their separation of employment pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

These common questions of law and fact set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendants' policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member. As such, the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual class member's showing as to their eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of their damages.

19. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Classes because Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the statute(s) of limitations period applicable to each cause of action pled in the Complaint. As alleged herein, Plaintiff, like the members of the Classes, was not paid all overtime wages owed due to Defendants' timekeeping and payroll policies/practices, was not provided all required meal periods, was not authorized and permitted all rest periods, did not receive premium pay for non-compliant meal and rest periods, was not paid all final wages upon separation of employment, and was not provided with accurate, compliant, itemized wage statements.

20. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary steps to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the members of the Classes. Moreover, Plaintiff's attorneys are ready, willing and able to fully and adequately represent the members of the Classes and Plaintiff. Plaintiff's attorneys have litigated numerous wage-and-hour class actions in state and federal courts in the past and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the members of the Classes.

21. **Superiority:** The Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves an important

1 public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California. These laws
2 and labor standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers who
3 have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to take advantage of superior economic
4 and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of employment. The nature of this
5 action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff and members of the Classes make the class
6 action format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to redress the violations alleged
7 herein. If each employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily
8 gain an unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited
9 resources of each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources.

10 22. Moreover, requiring each member of the Class(es) to pursue an individual remedy
11 would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file
12 an action against their former and/or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and
13 permanent damages to their careers at subsequent employment. The claims of the individual
14 members of the Class are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual prosecution
15 considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending hereto.

16 23. Furthermore, the prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members,
17 even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications
18 with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; and which would establish
19 potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or legal determinations with
20 respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interest
21 of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which would substantially impair or
22 impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. As such, the Classes identified
23 hereinabove are maintainable as classes under § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

24 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS**

26 **(Against All Defendants)**

27 24. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
28 fully set forth herein.

1 25. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1198, and
2 Wage Order 5, § 3, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to all overtime wages
3 and compensation for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure
4 to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

5 26. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly compensate non-
6 exempt employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class, for all overtime hours
7 worked pursuant to Labor Code § 1194 and Wage Order 5. Wage Order 5, § 3 requires an employer
8 to pay an employee one and one-half (1½) times and two times the employee's regular rate of pay
9 for overtime and double time hours work. Defendants caused Plaintiff and members of the Overtime
10 Class to work overtime hours but failed to compensate these employees for all overtime hours
11 actually worked.

12 27. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of overtime wages, Plaintiff and
13 members of the Overtime Class seek recovery of the balance of unpaid overtime wages, including
14 interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§
15 204, 210, 216, 218.6, 510, 1194, and 1198; Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and Civil Code §§
16 3287 and 3289.

17 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

19 **(Against All Defendants)**

20 28. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
21 fully set forth herein.

22 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed
23 in their affirmative obligation to provide all of their non-exempt employees in California, including
24 Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class, with all legally compliant meal periods in
25 accordance with the mandates of the Labor Code and Wage Order 5, § 11.

26 30. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants did not pay an additional hour of pay to
27 Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class at their respective regular rates of compensation, in
28 accordance with California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226.7, and 512.

1 31. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful meal period practices, Plaintiff and
2 members of the Meal Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for meal period
3 violations including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, pursuant to Labor Code
4 §§ 226.7, 512, 558, Wage Order 5, and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289.

5 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

7 **(Against All Defendants)**

8 32. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
9 fully set forth herein.

10 33. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and Wage Order 5, § 12 and establish the right of
11 employees to be provided with a rest period of at least 10 minutes for each four-hour period
12 worked, or major fraction thereof. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
13 despite Defendants' failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class
14 to take all legally compliant rest periods as alleged herein, Defendants did not pay these individuals
15 an additional hour of pay at their respective regular rate for the rest periods that they failed to
16 authorize and permit them to take, as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

17 34. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful rest period practices, Plaintiff and
18 members of the Rest Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for rest period violations
19 including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees,
20 and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, Wage Order 5, and Civil Code §§
21 3287 and 3289.

22 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES**

24 **(Against All Defendants)**

25 35. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
26 fully set forth herein.

27 36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
28 knowingly and intentionally, as a matter of uniform policy and practice, failed to furnish Plaintiff

1 and members of the Wage Statement Class with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements
2 that included, among other requirements, all hours worked, total gross wages earned, all rates of pay
3 and corresponding number of hours worked, total net wages earned, the inclusive dates of the pay
4 period, and/or the correct name and address of the legal entity that is the employer in violation of
5 Labor Code § 226.

6 37. Defendants' failure to furnish Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Class
7 with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements resulted in actual injury, as said failures led
8 to, among other things, the non-payment of overtime wages and meal and rest period premium
9 wages owed and deprived them of the information necessary to identify the discrepancies in
10 Defendants' reported payroll data.

11 38. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful wage statement practices, Plaintiff and
12 members of the Wage Statement Class seek damages and/or statutory penalties, reasonable
13 attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code § 226.

14 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**

16 **(Against All Defendants)**

17 39. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
18 fully set forth herein.

19 40. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201-203, which require an
20 employer to pay all wages immediately at the time of separation of employment in the event the
21 employer discharges the employee or the employee provides at least 72 hours of notice of their
22 intent to quit. In the event the employee provides less than 72 hours of notice of their intent to quit,
23 said employee's wages become due and payable not later than 72 hours upon said employee's last
24 date of employment.

25 41. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed
26 to timely pay Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Class all final wages due to them at their
27 separation from employment, including unpaid overtime wages as well as unpaid meal and rest
28 period premium wages.

1 42. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that as a
2 matter of uniform policy and practice, Defendants continue to fail to pay Plaintiff and members of
3 the Waiting Time Class all earned wages at the end of employment in a timely manner pursuant to
4 the requirements of Labor Code §§ 201-202.

5 43. Defendants' failure to pay all final wages was willful within the meaning of Labor
6 Code § 203. Defendants' willful failure to timely pay Plaintiff and the members of the Waiting
7 Time Class their earned wages upon separation from employment results in continued payment of
8 daily wages up to thirty days from the time the wages were due.

9 44. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful practices, Plaintiff and members of the
10 Waiting Time Class seek statutory penalties, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code §
11 203.

12 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

14 **(Against All Defendants)**

15 45. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
16 fully set forth herein.

17 46. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business
18 practices in California in violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, by:

- 19 a. failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class all overtime wages due;
- 20 b. failing to provide Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class with all meal
21 periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all meal period premium
22 wages due;
- 23 c. failing to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class all rest
24 periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all rest period premium
25 wages due;
- 26 d. failing to issue accurate and itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and members of
27 the Wage Statement Class; and
- 28 e. failing to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time

1 Penalty Class.

2 47. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived
3 Plaintiff and continues to deprive members of the Classes of compensation to which they are legally
4 entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage over
5 Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers and attempting to
6 do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws.

7 48. Because Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged
8 herein, Plaintiff for himself and on behalf of the members of the Classes, seeks full restitution of
9 monies, as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired
10 and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17208.

11 49. The acts complained of herein occurred within the last four years immediately
12 preceding the filing of the Complaint in this action.

13 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

15 **(Against All Defendants)**

16 50. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
17 fully set forth herein.

18 51. Plaintiff, an "aggrieved employee" within the meaning of Labor Code §§ 2698, *et*
19 *seq.*, acting on behalf of herself and other aggrieved employees (collectively, "Aggrieved
20 Employees"), brings this representative action against Defendants to recover the civil penalties due
21 to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant
22 to Labor Code §§ 558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial
23 violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or
24 intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210 and/or 225.5 for each failure to pay each
25 employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and
26 \$100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3)
27 \$100 for each initial violation and \$250 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code §
28 1197.1 per employee per pay period; (4) \$250 for each initial violation and \$1,000 for each

1 subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to
2 Labor Code § 256, a civil penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as
3 waiting time under the terms of Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) \$100 for each initial violation and
4 \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor
5 Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided, based on the following Labor Code
6 violations:

- 7 a. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned overtime compensation in violation
8 of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
- 9 b. Failing to provide all legally required meal periods, and failure to pay meal period
10 premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of compensation in
11 violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, and 1198;
- 12 c. Failing to authorize and permit all legally required rest periods, and failure to pay
13 rest period premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of
14 compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198;
- 15 d. Failing to furnish Aggrieved Employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage
16 statements in violation of Labor Code § 226;
- 17 e. Failing to timely pay all final wages and compensation earned by Aggrieved
18 Employees at the time of separation in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-202;
- 19 f. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all paid sick leave wages in violation of Labor
20 Code § 246;
- 21 g. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned wages at least twice during each
22 calendar month in violation of Labor Code § 204; and
- 23 h. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Aggrieved Employees in violation
24 of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1198.

25 52. On or about July 17, 2024, Plaintiff notified Defendants via certified mail, and
26 notified the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) via its website, of
27 Defendants’ violations of the Labor Code and Plaintiff’s intent to bring a claim for civil penalties
28 under Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* with respect to the violations of the Labor Code identified in the

1 preceding paragraph. Now that 33 days and 65 days have passed from Plaintiff notifying
2 Defendants and the LWDA of these violations, Defendants have not cured any curable violations,
3 and the LWDA has not provided notice that it intends to investigate the violations, Plaintiff has
4 exhausted administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act
5 with respect to these violations.

6 53. Plaintiff has incurred attorneys' fees and costs, which Plaintiff is entitled to receive
7 under California Labor Code § 2699(g).

8 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

9 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for herself and for all others on whose behalf
10 this suit is brought against Defendants, as follows:

- 11 1. For an order certifying the proposed Classes;
- 12 2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the Classes;
- 13 3. For an order appointing Counsel for Plaintiff as Counsel for the Classes;
- 14 4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for payment of overtime wages and penalties
15 according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
- 16 5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for meal period premium wages according to
17 proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558;
- 18 6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for rest period premium wages according to proof
19 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558;
- 20 7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code §
21 226;
- 22 8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code §
23 203;
- 24 9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiff and members of the
25 Classes of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or
26 practices declared by this Court to be in violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et*
27 *seq.*;
- 28 10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other

1 Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§
2 558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each
3 failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional
4 violation pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210 and/or 225.5 for each failure to pay each employee, plus
5 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each
6 subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$100.00 for
7 each initial violation and \$250.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1
8 per employee per pay period; (4) \$250.00 for each initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each
9 subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to
10 Labor Code § 256, a civil penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as
11 waiting time under the terms of Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) \$100.00 for each initial violation and
12 \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor
13 Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided;

14 11. Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6
15 and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289;

16 12. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code §§
17 218.5, 226, 1194, 2699(g), and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

18 13. For such other and further relief, the Court may deem just and proper.

19 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

20 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all claims.

21
22 DATED: September 24, 2024

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.

23
24 By: 

25 William C. Sung

26 Tiffany L. Luu

27 Attorneys for Plaintiff CHINYERE EZEKWESILI
28