

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jeffrey M. Schwartz, Esq. (SBN 254916)
Win Pham, Esq. (SBN 347399)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Emails: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
jschwartz@lelawfirm.com
wpham@lelawfirm.com

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
9/19/2024 5:33 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By E. Galicia, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff REUBEN LINARES,
on behalf of himself and current and former aggrieved employees

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES- CENTRAL DISTRICT

REUBEN LINARES, on behalf of himself and
current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

CALIFORNIA COMMERCIAL INVESTMENT
GROUP, INC.; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **24STCV24364**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF REUBEN LINARES'S
COMPLAINT FOR:**

- CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT
TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT OF 2004
("PAGA"), LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

COMES NOW Plaintiff REUBEN LINARES (“Plaintiff”), who alleges and complains on information and belief except as to those allegations relating to plaintiff himself, which are asserted on personal knowledge, against Defendants CALIFORNIA COMMERCIAL INVESTMENT GROUP, INC.; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive (collectively “Defendants”) as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California, himself and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-exempt employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated with Defendants’ violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants’ failure to pay wages for all hours worked at the employees’ minimum wage rate or overtime rate, failure to provide all legally required and legally compliant meal and rest periods, indemnification for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by employees in direct consequence of discharging their duties, failure to timely pay earned wages during employment, failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements, failure to timely pay all unpaid wages following separation of employment. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys’ fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff’s lawsuit seeks civil penalties on behalf of himself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of thirty-five thousand dollars (\$35,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout California, including but not limited to Los Angeles County, at 14801 Sherman Way, Van Nuys,

1 CA 91405.

2 **III. PARTIES**

3 3. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
4 Development Agency on behalf of himself and other current and former employees subject to
5 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
6 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will
7 work for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
8 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the
9 currently named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was
10 employed by Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Los Angeles County
11 from approximately March 2023 until on or about May 14, 2024.

12 4. Defendant CALIFORNIA COMMERCIAL INVESTMENT GROUP, INC. is
13 authorized to do business within the State of California and is doing business in the State of
14 California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant hereto were persons
15 acting on behalf of Defendant CALIFORNIA COMMERCIAL INVESTMENT GROUP, INC. in
16 the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or
17 policies. Defendant CALIFORNIA COMMERCIAL INVESTMENT GROUP, INC. operates in
18 Los Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County,
19 including but not limited to, at 14801 Sherman Way, Van Nuys, CA 91405.

20 5. Defendants DOES 1 through 50 are corporations or other business entities or
21 organizations of a nature unknown to Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California
22 non-exempt employees, permitted Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised
23 control over the wages, hours and working conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved
24 employees.

25 6. Defendants DOES 51 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each
26 Defendant is sued individually and in their capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner,
27 representative, manager, supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant
28 who violated or caused to be violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor

Code and/or any provision of the Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

7. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100. Plaintiff sues said defendants by said fictitious names and will amend this complaint when the true names and capacities are ascertained or when such facts pertaining to liability are ascertained, or as permitted by law or by the Court. Each fictitiously named defendant is in some manner responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this complaint.

8. Plaintiff makes the allegations in this complaint without any admission that, as to any particular allegation, Plaintiff bears the burden of pleading, proving, or persuading and Plaintiff reserves all of Plaintiff's right to plead in the alternative.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

**CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF
2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

**(Against all Defendants by Plaintiff on behalf of Themselves, the State of California, and
Other Current and Former Aggrieved Employees)**

9. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges each and every allegation contained in this pleading as though fully set forth herein.

10. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 2802, and the applicable Wage Orders.

11. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California Labor Code:

12. **Failure to pay wages for all hours worked at the legal minimum wage:** Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt employees. In California, an employer is required to pay hourly employees for all "hours worked," which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either directly or indirectly, performing services which inure to the benefit of the employer.

1 13. Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 require an employer to compensate employees
2 for all “hours worked” at least at a minimum wage rate of pay as established by the IWC and the
3 Wage Orders.

4 14. In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
5 hourly non-exempt employees worked more minutes per shift than Defendants credited them with
6 having worked. Specifically, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former
7 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages at the applicable minimum
8 wage for all hours worked due to Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but
9 not limited to:

10 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
11 non-exempt employees to clock out for their meal breaks and continue to work through their off-
12 the-clock meal breaks and/or have their meal breaks interrupted.

13 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
14 non-exempt employees to be “on call” with geographical restrictions to their physical movement,
15 such as requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
16 exempt employees to remain in or return to the vicinity of the workplace during breaks and/or
17 other off-the-clock periods. Consequently, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
18 California-based hourly non-exempt employees were “engaged to wait” and under the control of
19 Defendants, but Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
20 California-based hourly non-exempt employees for hours spent “on call.”

21 15. Therefore, Defendants suffered, permitted, and required Plaintiff and other current
22 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to be subject to Defendants’
23 control without paying wages for that time. This resulted in Plaintiff and other current and former
24 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees working time for which they were not
25 compensated any wages, in violation of Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 and the applicable
26 Wage Order.

27 16. **Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay:**
28 Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt

1 employees. In California, an employer is required to pay hourly employees for all “hours worked,”
2 which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the
3 employee is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either
4 directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to the benefit of the employer.

5 17. Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 require an employer to compensate employees a
6 higher rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, in excess of forty
7 (40) hours in a workweek, and on any seventh consecutive day of work in a workweek:

8 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40)
9 hours in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of
10 work in any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-
11 one-half (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve
12 (12) hours in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular
13 rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any
14 seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the
15 regular rate of pay of an employee. Labor Code § 510.

16 18. In this case, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former
17 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees overtime wages for all overtime hours
18 worked due to Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to:

19 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
20 non-exempt employees to clock out for their meal breaks and continue to work through their off-
21 the-clock meal breaks and/or have their meal breaks interrupted.

22 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
23 non-exempt employees to be “on call” with geographical restrictions to their physical movement,
24 such as requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
25 exempt employees to remain in or return to the vicinity of the workplace during breaks and/or
26 other off-the-clock periods. Consequently, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
27 California-based hourly non-exempt employees were “engaged to wait” and under the control of
28 Defendants, but Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
California-based hourly non-exempt employees for hours spent “on call.”

1 19. The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each
2 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
3 employees were under the control of Defendants but were not compensated. To the extent that the
4 foregoing uncompensated time occurred when Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
5 California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday,
6 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendants failed
7 to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code
8 sections 510, 1194 and 1198, and the applicable Wage Order.

9 20. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
10 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant meal periods:** Plaintiff and other
11 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked
12 shifts of more than five (5) hours in length and shifts of more than ten (10) hours in length.

13 21. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an
14 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of
15 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the
16 employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 4 at § 11;
17 *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not
18 employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the
19 employee with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of
20 the eleventh hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the
21 meal period shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. A paid "on
22 duty" meal period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from
23 being relieved of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal
24 periods.

25 22. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
26 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay
27 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
28 §§ 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 4 at § 11.

1 23. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit legally required and compliant
2 meal periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
3 exempt employees due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures, including but not
4 limited to:

5 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
6 non-exempt employees to clock out for their meal breaks and continue to work through their off-
7 the-clock meal breaks and/or have their meal breaks interrupted.

8 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
9 non-exempt employees to be "on call" with geographical restrictions to their physical movement,
10 such as requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
11 exempt employees to remain in or return to the vicinity of the workplace during breaks and/or
12 other off-the-clock periods. Consequently, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
13 California-based hourly non-exempt employees were "engaged to wait" and under the control of
14 Defendants, but Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
15 California-based hourly non-exempt employees for hours spent "on call."

16
17 24. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
18 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
19 based hourly non-exempt employees one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each
20 workday that Plaintiff and/or other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
21 exempt employees did not receive legally required and compliant meal periods, in violation of
22 Labor Code section 226.7.

23 25. Defendants' foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff
24 and/or other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not
25 receiving wages to compensate them for workdays during which Defendants did not provide them
26 with meal periods in compliance with California law.

27 26. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
28 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant rest periods:** Plaintiff and other

1 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked
2 shifts of more than three-and-a-half (3.5) hours.

3
4 27. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
5 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor
6 Code § 226.7; Wage Order 4 at § 12. Under California law, “[e]mployees are entitled to 10
7 minutes’ rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more
8 than six hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so
9 on.” *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code
10 § 226.7; Wage Order 4 at § 12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each
11 work period. Wage Order 4 at § 12. Additionally, the rest period requirement “obligates employers
12 to permit – and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM Security*
13 *Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve
14 employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

15 28. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer
16 must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday
17 the employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code § 226.7; Wage
18 Order 4 at § 12.

19 29. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit all legally required and
20 compliant rest periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
21 non-exempt employees due to Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not
22 limited to,

23 (a) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
24 hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours worked
or major fraction thereof.

25 (b) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
26 non-exempt employees to be “on call” with geographical restrictions to their physical movement,
27 such as requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
28 exempt employees to remain in or return to the vicinity of the workplace during breaks and/or
other off-the-clock periods. Consequently, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved

1 California-based hourly non-exempt employees were “engaged to wait” and under the control of
2 Defendants.

3 30. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
4 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
5 based hourly non-exempt employees with one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each
6 workday they did not receive legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor
7 Code section 226.7.

8 31. Defendants’ foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff
9 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not
10 receiving wages to compensate them for workdays in which Defendants did not provide them with
11 rest periods in compliance with California law.

12 32. **Failure to Indemnify for Losses and Expenditures Incurred as Part of**
13 **Employment:** California law requires that every employer must indemnify its employees for all
14 necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in discharge of his or her duties or at
15 the obedience of the directions of the employer. Moreover, an employer is prohibited from passing
16 the ordinary business expenses and losses of the employer onto the employee. (Lab. Code, §
17 2802.)

18 33. Defendants violated Labor Code Section 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiff and
19 other current and former aggrieved California-based non-exempt hourly employees’ necessary
20 expenditures they incurred in the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendants employed a
21 policy, practice, and procedure,

22 (a) requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
23 non-exempt employees to use or purchase their own tools and/or resources in order to work for
24 Defendants, including but not limited to cell phone (including both telephone use and cellular data
25 use) for work-related purposes - without always reimbursing Plaintiff and other current and former
26 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees for such use.

27 34. Moreover, Defendants employed policies and procedures which ensured Plaintiff
28 and aggrieved employees would not receive indemnification for their employment related

1 expenses. This practice resulted in Plaintiff and aggrieved employees not receiving such
2 indemnification in compliance with California law.

3
4 35. Therefore, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for their
5 employment related expenses, including but not limited to costs related to use of their personal
6 cell phones and costs associated with their uniforms pursuant to Labor Code section 2802.

7 36. **Failure to timely pay earned wages during employment:** In California, wages
8 must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the
9 employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code § 204(a). Wages earned
10 between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 16th
11 and the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of
12 any calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. *Id.* Other
13 payroll periods such as those that are weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly, must be paid within
14 seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period in which wages were earned.
15 Labor Code § 204(d).

16 37. As a derivative of Plaintiff's claims above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed
17 to timely pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
18 employees their earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium
19 wages and/or rest period premium wages), in violation of Labor Code section 204. Defendants'
20 aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in their failure to pay Plaintiff and
21 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees their earned
22 wages within the applicable time frames outlined in Labor Code section 204.

23 38. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
24 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
25 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
26 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including
27 by failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and
28 lawful sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7,
246, 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by

1 Labor Code section 1198, Defendants secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while
2 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

3
4 39. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section
5 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an
6 employee his or her wages, the employer must “furnish each of his or her employees ... an
7 itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the
8 employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is
9 exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of
10 the Industrial Welfare Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable
11 piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all
12 deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5)
13 net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the
14 name of the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal
15 entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
16 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

17 40. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff
18 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
19 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest
20 period premium wages) rendered Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-
21 based hourly non-exempt employees’ wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code
22 section 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

23 41. **Failure to pay employees all wages due at time of termination/resignation:** An
24 employer is required to pay all unpaid wages timely after an employee’s employment ends. The
25 wages are due immediately upon termination (Labor Code section 201) or within seventy-two (72)
26 hours of resignation (Labor Code section 202).

27 42. As a derivative of Plaintiff’s allegations above, because Defendants failed to pay
28 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
all of their earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium

1 wages, and/or rest period premium wages), Defendants failed to pay those employees timely after
2 each employee's termination and/or resignation, in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and
3 203.

4 43. Labor Code sections 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g), authorize an aggrieved
5 employee, on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees, to bring a civil
6 action to recover civil penalties against all Defendants pursuant to the procedures specified in
7 Labor Code section 2699.3.

8 44. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor
9 Code section 2699.3. On July 15, 2024, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and
10 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of
11 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
12 violations alleged.

13 45. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by
14 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code
15 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the
16 parties notice within 65 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends
17 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

18 46. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
19 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a),
20 226.7, 510, 512, and 1194, During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present,
21 preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the
22 following amounts:

23 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, and
24 2802; one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial
25 violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each
26 subsequent violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

27 b. For violations of Labor Code section 226(a), alternatively, two hundred
28 fifty dollars (\$250) for each employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and one

1 thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each subsequent violation, for each underpaid employee for each pay
2 period [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 226.3].

3 c. For violations of Labor Code section 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50) for
4 each employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for
5 each subsequent violation, for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts
6 established by Labor Code section 558].

7 d. For violations of Labor Code section 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for
8 each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each
9 subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, for each failure to pay each employee,
10 plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code
11 section 210].

12 e. For violations of Labor Code section 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for
13 each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each
14 subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, for each failure to pay each employee,
15 plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld [penalty amounts established by Labor Code
16 section 225.5].

17 47. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g), Plaintiff is entitled to an award of
18 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with his/her claims for civil penalties.

19 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

20 **WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND ON OTHER AGGRIEVED**
21 **EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:**

22 **ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:**

23 1. That Defendants be found to have violated the provisions of the Labor Code and
24 the IWC Wages Orders as to the Plaintiff and aggrieved employees;

25 2. For any and all legally applicable penalties during the relevant statute of limitations
26 subject to any permissible tolling, including but not limited to those recoverable under the
27 California Labor Code, including but not limited to sections 210, 225.5, 226.3, 558, 2699(f);

28 3. For attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including but not limited to those recoverable

1 under California Labor Code section 2699(g); and

2 4. For such and other further relief, in law and/or equity, as the Court deems just or
3 appropriate.
4

5 Dated: September 19, 2024

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

7
8 By:



Joseph Lavi, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Jeffrey M. Schwartz, Esq.
Win Pham, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
REUBEN LINARES
on behalf of himself and current and former
aggrieved employees