

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jovahn Wiggins, Esq. (SBN 349903)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
jwiggins@lelawfirm.com

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
12/27/2024 4:37 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By D. Williams, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff NANCY GUARDADO,
on behalf of herself and current and former aggrieved employees

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

NANCY GUARDADO, on behalf of herself and
current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

EMPLOYER'S OUTSOURCING, LLC; and
DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **24STCV34351**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF NANCY GUARDADO'S
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

COMES NOW Plaintiff NANCY GUARDADO ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of herself and
current and former aggrieved employees, who alleges and complains on information and belief
except as to those allegations relating to plaintiff himself/herself, which are asserted on personal
knowledge, against Defendants EMPLOYER'S OUTSOURCING, LLC; and DOES 1 to 100,
inclusive (collectively "Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

- This is a Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*

1 (“PAGA”) representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California, herself and
2 other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-exempt
3 employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated with
4 Defendants’ violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants’ failure to pay wages for all hours
5 worked at the employees’ minimum wage rate or overtime rate, failure to provide all legally required
6 and legally compliant meal and rest periods, failure to timely pay earned wages during employment,
7 failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements, failure to timely pay all unpaid wages
8 following separation of employment. Plaintiff seeks on a representative basis, following notice to
9 the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys’ fees pursuant
10 to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California,
11 and others aggrieved.

12 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
14 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff’s lawsuit seeks
15 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
16 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of thirty-five thousand dollars
17 (\$35,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
18 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
19 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
20 California, including but not limited to Los Angeles County, at 100 Terranea Way, Rancho Palos
21 Verdes, CA 90275.

22 **III. PARTIES**

23 3. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
24 Development Agency on behalf of herself and other current and former employees subject to
25 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
26 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work
27 for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
28 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently

1 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by
2 Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Los Angeles County from approximately
3 January 30, 2023 until on or about June 17, 2024.

4 4. Defendant EMPLOYER'S OUTSOURCING, LLC is authorized to do business
5 within the State of California and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants
6 DOES 1-50 are, and at all times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant
7 EMPLOYER'S OUTSOURCING, LLC in the establishment of, or ratification of, the
8 aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies. Defendant EMPLOYER'S
9 OUTSOURCING, LLC operates in Los Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved
10 employees in Los Angeles County, including but not limited to, at 100 Terranea Way, Rancho Palos
11 Verdes, CA 90275.

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

16 6. Defendants DOES 51 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each
17 Defendant is sued individually and in their capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner, representative,
18 manager, supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant who violated or
19 caused to be violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor Code and/or any
20 provision of the Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

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

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

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

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, 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.

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

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

1 (a) requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
2 non-exempt employees to remain on-duty during their off-the-clock meal breaks due to Defendants'
3 requirement that Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
4 exempt employees' keep the company's communication device on them and monitored at all times
5 during their shift including during off the clock meal breaks so they can be contacted by Defendants
6 or Defendants' clients at any time during their shift.

7
8 15. Therefore, Defendants suffered, permitted, and required Plaintiff and other current
9 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to be subject to Defendants'
10 control without paying wages for that time. This resulted in Plaintiff and other current and former
11 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees working time for which they were not
12 compensated any wages, in violation of Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 and the applicable
13 Wage Order.

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

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

23 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40) hours
24 in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in
25 any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-one-half
26 (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve (12) hours
27 in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay
28 for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a
workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an
employee. Labor Code § 510.

18. In this case, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved

California-based hourly non-exempt employees overtime wages for all overtime hours worked due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to:

(a) requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to remain on-duty during their off-the-clock meal breaks due to Defendants' requirement that Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' keep the company's communication device on them and monitored at all times during their shift including during off the clock meal breaks so they can be contacted by Defendants or Defendants' clients at any time during their shift.

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

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

21. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 5 at § 11; *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period

1 shall be considered an “on duty” meal period and counted as time worked. A paid “on duty” meal
2 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved
3 of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

4 22. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
5 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay
6 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
7 §§ 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 5 at § 11.

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

12 (a) requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
13 non-exempt employees to remain on-duty during their off-the-clock meal breaks due to Defendants’
14 requirement that Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
15 exempt employees’ keep the company’s communication device on them and monitored at all times
16 during off the clock meal breaks.

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-based
19 hourly non-exempt employees one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday that
20 Plaintiff and/or other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
21 did not receive legally required and compliant meal periods, in violation of Labor Code section
22 226.7.

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

14 28. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer must
15 pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday the
16 employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code § 226.7; Wage Order
17 5 at § 12.

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

22 (a) requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
23 hourly non-exempt employees to remain on-duty during their rest breaks due to Defendants’
24 requirement that Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
25 exempt employees’ keep the company’s communication device on them and monitored at all times
26 during rest breaks.

27 30. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
28 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based

1 hourly non-exempt employees with one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday
2 they did not receive legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor Code section
3 226.7.

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

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

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

24 34. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
25 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
26 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
27 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by
28 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful

1 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,
2 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor
3 Code section 1198, Defendants secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while
4 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

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

18 **36.** As a derivative of Plaintiff's allegations above, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff
19 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages
20 earned (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period
21 premium wages) rendered Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based
22 hourly non-exempt employees' wage statements inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section
23 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

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

28 **38.** As a derivative of Plaintiff's allegations above, because Defendants failed to pay

1 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all
2 of their earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages,
3 and/or rest period premium wages), Defendants failed to pay those employees timely after each
4 employee's termination and/or resignation, in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

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

9 40. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
10 section 2699.3. On September 25, 2024, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and
11 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of
12 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
13 violations alleged.

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

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

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

28 b. For violations of Labor Code section 226(a), alternatively, two hundred fifty

1 dollars (\$250) for each employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and one thousand
2 dollars (\$1,000) for each subsequent violation, for each underpaid employee for each pay period
3 [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 226.3].

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

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

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

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

20 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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

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

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

1 3. For attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including but not limited to those recoverable
2 under California Labor Code section 2699(g); and

3 4. For such and other further relief, in law and/or equity, as the Court deems just or
4 appropriate.
5

6 Dated: December 27, 2024

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

7
8 By:



Joseph Lavi, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Jovahn Wiggins, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
NANCY GUARDADO, on behalf of herself and
current and former aggrieved employees