

Karen I. Gold (State Bar No. 258360)
kgold@blackstonepc.com
Sara Pezeshkpour (State Bar No. 260240)
spezeshkpour@blackstonepc.com
Noam Reiffman (State Bar No. 299446)
nreiffman@blackstonepc.com
Marissa A. Mayhood (State Bar No. 334376)
mmayhood@blackstonepc.com
Alexandra Rose (State Bar No. 329407)
arose@blackstonepc.com
BLACKSTONE LAW, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 622-4278 / Facsimile: (855) 786-6356

*Attorneys for Plaintiff ARIANA CRISAFULLI, individually,
and on behalf of other similarly situated employees,
and GINA MARIE GIOVACCHINI, individually, and on
behalf of aggrieved employees pursuant to the California
Private Attorneys General Act*

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

ARIANA CRISAFULLI, individually, and on
behalf of other similarly situated employees, and
GINA MARIE GIOVACCHINI, individually,
and on behalf of aggrieved employees pursuant
to the California Private Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

SONOMA MEDIA INVESTMENTS, LLC; and
DOES 1 through 25, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 24CV05458

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT**

- (1) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 (Minimum Wages)**
- (2) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 204.3, 510, and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime)**
- (3) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Meal Break Violations)**
- (4) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226.7 (Rest Break Violations)**
- (5) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 204 and 210 (Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment)**
- (6) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226(a) (Wage Statement Violations)**
- (7) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 (Untimely Final Wages)**
- (8) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses)**

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

- (9) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 233 and 245-249 (Failure to Provide Sick Leave and Notice of Entitlement to Sick Leave)**
- (10) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 227.3 (Unpaid Vacation Time)**
- (11) Violation of Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (Unfair and Unlawful Business Practices)**
- (12) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* (California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004)**
- (13) Violation of Fair Labor Standards Act 29 U.S.C. § 206 (Unpaid Minimum Wages)**
- (14) Violation of Fair Labor Standards Act 29 U.S.C. § 207 (Unpaid Overtime)**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff ARIANA CRISAFULLI (“Plaintiff Crisafulli”) individually, and on behalf of other
2 similarly situated employees, and Plaintiff GINA MARIE GIOVACCHINI (“Plaintiff Giovacchini”),
3 individually, on behalf of aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General
4 Act (“PAGA”) (together, the “Plaintiffs”), allege as follows against Defendant(s) SONOMA MEDIA
5 INVESTMENTS, LLC, and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive (collectively, “Defendants”):

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. This is a class action to recover damages on behalf of Plaintiff Crisafulli and all current
8 and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of
9 California at any time during the period from four years prior to the date of the filing of the original
10 Complaint through final judgment (“Class Members”).

11 2. This is also an enforcement action under PAGA to recover civil penalties on behalf of
12 Plaintiff Giovacchini, the State of California, and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-
13 exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California at any time from one year
14 prior to Plaintiff Giovacchini’s submission of written notice of Defendants’ alleged violations of the
15 California Labor Code to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) through final
16 judgment (“Aggrieved Employees”).

17 3. Plaintiff Crisafulli alleges that Defendants hired Plaintiffs and Class Members but,
18 among other things, failed to properly calculate the regular rate and pay them all wages owed for all
19 time worked (including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages or paid time off in
20 lieu thereof), failed to provide them with all meal periods and rest periods and associated premium
21 wages to which they were entitled, failed to timely pay them all wages due during their employment,
22 failed to timely pay them all wages due upon termination of their employment, failed to provide them
23 with accurate itemized wage statements, failed to provide sick leave and notice of entitlement to sick
24 leave, failed to pay vested, unused vacation pay upon termination, and failed to reimburse them for
25 necessary business expenses.

26 4. As a result, Defendants violated, *inter alia*, California Labor Code sections 201, 202,
27 203, 204, 204.3, 210, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 233, 245-249, 510, 512(a), 515, 551, 552, 558, 558.1, 1174(d),
28 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2699, 2800, and 2802, tit. 8 CCR section

1 11040(5)(A)-(B), and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order. Through
2 this action, Plaintiffs seek to recover all available remedies including but not limited to actual and
3 liquidated damages and attorneys’ fees and costs.

4 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5 5. This is a class action lawsuit brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure
6 section 382 and a PAGA action brought pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*

7 6. The monetary damages, restitution, statutory penalties, and other applicable legal and
8 equitable relief sought by Plaintiffs exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and
9 will be established according to proof at trial.

10 7. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution,
11 Article VI, section 10, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all other causes” except
12 those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify
13 any other basis for jurisdiction.

14 8. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and belief,
15 Defendants are either citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, and/or
16 otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of
17 jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and
18 substantial justice. Further, no federal question is at issue because the claims asserted herein are based
19 solely on California law.

20 9. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants
21 maintain offices, have agents, employ individuals, and/or transact business in the State of California,
22 County of Sonoma, including at 416 B Street, Suite C, Santa Rosa, CA 95401. Many of the acts,
23 events, and violations alleged herein relating to Plaintiffs occurred throughout the State of California,
24 including in the County of Sonoma.

25 **THE PARTIES**

26 10. At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff are and were individuals residing in the State
27 of California.

28 ///

1 11. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant SONOMA MEDIA INVESTMENTS, LLC
2 was and is an employer who does business in California, with locations throughout the State of
3 California, and whose employees are engaged throughout Sonoma County and the State of California,
4 including at 416 B Steet, Suite C, Santa Rosa, CA 95401.

5 12. Plaintiffs are unaware of the true names or capacities of the Defendants sued herein
6 under the fictitious names DOES 1 through 25 but will seek leave of this Court to amend the Complaint
7 and serve such fictitiously named Defendants once their names and capacities become known.

8 13. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that the acts and omissions
9 alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to Defendants, each acting as the agent,
10 employee, alter ego, and/or joint venturer of, or working in concert with, each of the other co-
11 Defendants and within the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted
12 activity with legal authority to act on the others' behalf. The acts of Defendants represent and were in
13 accordance with Defendants' official policies.

14 14. At all relevant times, Defendants were the employers of Plaintiffs within the meaning
15 of all applicable state laws and statutes. Defendants directly or indirectly controlled or affected the
16 working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiffs so as to make
17 each of said Defendants employers and employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

18 15. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiffs and the other Class
19 Members, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiffs and the other Class Members'
20 employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

21 16. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiffs
22 and the other Class Members' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiffs and the other
23 Class Members.

24 17. Defendants directly hired and paid wages to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members.

25 18. Defendants continue to employ hourly paid and/or non-exempt employees within the
26 State of California.

27 ///

28 ///

19. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, ratified each act or omission complained of herein. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of each and all the other Defendants in proximately causing the damages herein alleged.

20. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that each Defendant is in some manner intentionally, negligently, or otherwise responsible for the acts, omissions, occurrences, and transactions alleged herein.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

21. Defendants jointly and severally employed Plaintiff Crisafulli from approximately June 2022 through approximately December 2022 as an Event Coordinator. She performed various duties for Defendants including, among other things, event planning and marketing.

22. Defendants jointly and severally employed Plaintiff Giovacchini from approximately June 2013 through approximately August 2024 as a Senior Credit Analyst. She performed various duties for Defendants including, among other things, processing payments, applications, and mail.

23. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants engaged in a pattern and practice of wage abuse against their hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees. As set forth in more detail below, this pattern and practice of wage abuse involved, *inter alia*, requiring Plaintiffs, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to properly calculate the regular rate and pay wages for all hours worked, failing to provide all meal and rest breaks to which they were entitled and failing to pay meal and rest break premiums when due, failing to timely pay wages during employment and upon termination of employment, failing to provide accurate wage statements, failing to provide sick leave and notice of entitlement to sick leave, failing to pay unused accrued vacation pay, failing to reimburse necessary business-related expenses, and failing to adhere to other related protections afforded by the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

24. Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiffs and the other Class Members pursuant to California law. Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so to increase Defendants' profits.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

25. Plaintiff Crisafulli brings this lawsuit as a class action on behalf of Plaintiff Crisafulli and all others similarly situated, as members of a proposed class pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The class satisfies the numerosity, commonality, typicality, adequacy, predominance, and superiority requirements under California Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

26. The proposed **Class** is defined as follows:

All current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California at any time during the period from four years prior to the date of the filing of the original Complaint through final judgment.

27. The proposed **Former Employee Sub-Class** is defined as follows:

All former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California at any time during the period from four years prior to the date of the filing of this Complaint through final judgment.

28. Plaintiff Crisafulli reserves the right to establish additional subclasses as appropriate.

29. There is a well-defined community of interest in this litigation and the Class is easily ascertainable. While the exact number and identities of Class Members are currently unknown to Plaintiff Crisafulli, such information can be ascertained through appropriate discovery from records maintained by Defendants and their agents.

30. The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all its members is impracticable.

31. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all Class Members, which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. The common legal and factual questions which do not vary from Class Member to Class Member, and which may be determined without reference to the individual circumstances of any Class Member include the following:

- i. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members for all hours worked;

///

- 1 ii. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to properly calculate the
2 regular rate and pay overtime wages to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members for all
3 overtime hours worked;
- 4 iii. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to provide meal periods to
5 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members;
- 6 iv. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to provide rest periods to
7 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members;
- 8 v. Whether Defendants failed to pay their hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees in
9 the State of California for all hours worked, and for all missed, short, late, and/or
10 interrupted meal periods and rest breaks;
- 11 vi. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiffs and the other Class
12 Members during their employment;
- 13 vii. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or reduction, in
14 accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;
- 15 viii. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiffs and the other Class
16 Members within the required time upon their discharge or resignation;
- 17 ix. Whether Defendants failed to comply with wage reporting as required by the California
18 Labor Code, including, *inter alia*, section 226;
- 19 x. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other Class Members for
20 necessary business-related expenses and costs;
- 21 xi. Whether Defendants failed to provide sick leave and failed to provide notice of
22 entitlement to sick leave;
- 23 xii. Whether Defendants failed to pay accrued vacation pay to Plaintiffs and the other Class
24 Members;
- 25 xiii. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- 26 xiv. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California
27 Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;

28 ///

xv. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and

xvi. Whether Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

32. Plaintiff Crisafulli's claims are typical of the claims of the Class, and Plaintiff Crisafulli's interests are coincident with and not antagonistic to those of the other Class Members Plaintiff Crisafulli seeks to represent. Plaintiff Crisafulli will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class. Plaintiff Crisafulli has retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of class actions and intends to prosecute this action vigorously.

33. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy since individual litigation of the claims of all Class Members is impracticable. Even if every Class Member could afford individual litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly burdensome on the courts in which individual litigation of numerous cases would proceed. Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent, and/or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense to all parties and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same factual and legal issues. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action presents fewer management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and of the court system, and protects the rights of each Class Member.

34. Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. However, class actions provide the Class Members who are not named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights.

PAGA ALLEGATIONS

35. PAGA is and was applicable to Defendants' employment of Plaintiff Gina Marie Giovacchini and the Aggrieved Employees.

36. PAGA provides that any provision of law under the California Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty, including unpaid wages and premium wages, to be assessed and collected

1 by the LWDA for violations of the California Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through
2 a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or
3 former employees pursuant to procedures outlined in California Labor Code section 2699.3.

4 37. Pursuant to PAGA, a civil action may be brought by an “aggrieved employee,” who is
5 any person employed by the alleged violator and against whom one or more of the alleged violations
6 was committed.

7 38. Plaintiff Giovacchini and the other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees are “Aggrieved
8 Employees” as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) because they are current or former
9 employees of Defendants against whom one of more of the alleged violations were committed.

10 39. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, an aggrieved employee,
11 including Plaintiff Giovacchini, may pursue a civil action arising under PAGA after the following
12 requirements have been met:

13 a. The aggrieved employee shall give written notice by certified mail (hereinafter
14 “Employee’s Notice”) to the LWDA and the employer of the specific provisions of the
15 California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories
16 to support the alleged violations.

17 b. The LWDA shall provide notice (“LWDA Response”) to the employer and the
18 aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not intend to investigate the alleged
19 violation within sixty (60) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee’s
20 Notice. Upon receipt of the LWDA Response, or if the LWDA Response is not
21 provided within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee’s
22 Notice, the aggrieved employee may commence a civil action pursuant to California
23 Labor Code section 2699 to recover civil penalties in addition to any other penalties to
24 which the employee may be entitled.

25 40. On September 12, 2024, Plaintiff Giovacchini provided notice by electronic submission
26 to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants regarding the specific provisions of the California
27 Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged
28 violations, pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.3. A true and correct copy of this notice is

1 attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

2 41. On July 22, 2025, Plaintiff Giovacchini provided an amended notice by electronic
3 submission to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants regarding the additional provisions of
4 the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support
5 the alleged violations, pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.3. A true and correct copy of
6 this amended notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

7 42. As of the date of this filing, Plaintiff Giovacchini has not received an LWDA Response
8 to either of the notices.

9 43. Therefore, the administrative prerequisites under California Labor Code section
10 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendants, in addition to other remedies for violations of,
11 *inter alia*, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 204.3, 210, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 233, 245-
12 249, 510, 512(a), 515, 551, 552, 558, 558.1, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
13 1198.5, 1199, 2699, 2800, and 2802 have been satisfied.

14 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 1194, 1197, AND 1197.1**

16 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wage**

17 **(Against All Defendants)**

18 44. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

19 45. California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 provide that the minimum wage
20 for employees fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is the minimum wage to be paid to
21 employees, and the payment of a wage less than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. Plaintiffs and the
22 other Class Members were frequently suffered or permitted to work “off-the-clock” prior to clocking-
23 in and after clocking-out, such that they were not paid minimum wage for all hours worked.
24 Defendants adjusted Plaintiffs’ and other Class Members’ timesheets to avoid paying them for all time
25 worked.

26 46. Moreover, Defendants had a policy, practice, and procedure of rounding employee time
27 such that Plaintiffs and some or all Class Members were systematically unpaid and/or underpaid for
28 time worked over the course of their employment.

1 47. Accordingly, Defendants regularly failed to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiffs
2 and the other Class Members for all hours they worked in violation of California Labor Code sections
3 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

4 48. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other Class Members
5 were performing such work “off-the-clock” because, among other things, Defendants’ management
6 witnessed, authorized, was made aware of, and/or required Plaintiffs, and Class Members to perform
7 such work.

8 49. Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members the minimum wage
9 as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Pursuant to those sections,
10 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum
11 wage compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorney’s fees.

12 50. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiffs and the other Class
13 Members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully
14 unpaid and interest thereon.

15 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 204.3, 510, AND 1198**

17 **Unpaid Overtime**

18 **(Against All Defendants)**

19 51. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

20 52. California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that
21 it is unlawful to employ persons for extended periods of time without compensating them at a rate of
22 pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person’s regular rate of pay, depending on the number
23 of hours worked by the person on a daily and/or weekly basis.

24 53. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants were required
25 to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members at the rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in
26 excess of eight (8) hours in a day, in excess of forty (40) hours in a week, and/or in excess of the first
27 eight (8) hours worked on the seventh consecutive day in a workweek.

28 ///

1 54. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants were required to pay
2 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members overtime compensation at a rate of two (2) times their regular
3 rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day and/or for all hours worked in
4 excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day in a workweek.

5 55. California Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-
6 and-one half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, in
7 excess of forty (40) hours in a week, and/or in excess of the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh
8 consecutive day in a workweek, and to overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for
9 hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the
10 seventh day of work.

11 56. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members regularly worked in excess of eight (8) hours in
12 a day, in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day, in excess of forty (40) hours in a week, and/or in excess
13 of seven (7) consecutive days in a workweek. However, Defendants did not accurately record Plaintiffs
14 and the other Class Members' actual hours worked and intentionally and willfully failed to pay all
15 overtime wages owed to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members. Defendants' failure to pay correct
16 overtime wages included, *inter alia*: (a) when the combined total of the off-the-clock work discussed
17 *supra* and the on-the-clock work exceed the number of hours that trigger the payment of overtime
18 wages under California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and/or the applicable IWC Wage Order;
19 (b) when Defendants intentionally, willfully, and/or negligently mischaracterized overtime as straight
20 time; (c) when Defendants assigned more work than could reasonably be completed in a workday or
21 workweek to Plaintiffs and Class Members, but refused to authorize the overtime necessary for them
22 to complete the assigned work; and (d) when Defendants failed to include all required wages and
23 renumeration when calculating setting the overtime rate. Defendants adjusted Plaintiffs' and other
24 Class Members' timesheets to avoid paying them for all time worked and/or required Plaintiff and
25 other Class Members to "clock out" but continue working to avoid paying them proper overtime
26 compensation.

27 ///

28 ///

1 57. Defendants failed to properly compensate Plaintiffs and other Class Members for
2 overtime hours by failing, *inter alia*, to properly calculate the regular rate of pay or by excluding all
3 applicable remuneration including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and
4 non-discretionary performance pay. As a result, Defendants violated California Labor Code sections
5 204, 204.3, 210, 510, 515, 551, 552, 558, 558.1, 1182.12, 1198, title 8 CCR section 11040(5)(A)-(B),
6 and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

7 58. Further, Defendants violated California Labor Code section 204.3 by failing to provide
8 Plaintiffs and Class Members with compensating time off at a rate of not less than one and one-half
9 hours for each hour of employment for which overtime compensation is required by law in lieu of the
10 overtime pay.

11 59. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members
12 are entitled to recover their unpaid overtime compensation, and interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

13 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 226.7 AND 512(a)**

15 **Meal Break Violations**

16 **(Against All Defendants)**

17 60. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

18 61. California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order
19 govern Plaintiff and the other Class Members' employment by Defendants.

20 62. California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an
21 employee to work during any meal period mandated by an applicable IWC Order.

22 63. The applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) provide
23 that an employer may not require, cause, or permit an employee to work for a period of more than five
24 (5) hours per day without providing the employee with an uninterrupted meal period of not less than
25 thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is not more than six
26 (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee.

27 ///

28 ///

1 64. The applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) further
2 provide that an employer may not require, cause, or permit an employee to work a work period of
3 more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal
4 period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12)
5 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee
6 only if the first meal period was not waived.

7 65. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members who were scheduled to work for shifts no longer
8 than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their legally mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were
9 required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not
10 less than thirty (30) minutes.

11 66. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members who were scheduled to work for shifts in excess
12 of ten (10) hours but no longer than twelve (12) hours, and who did not waive their legally-mandated
13 meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without
14 a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

15 67. Defendants intentionally and willfully required Plaintiffs and the other Class Members
16 to work during meal periods and failed to compensate Plaintiffs and the other Class Members for work
17 performed during meal periods. This includes, among other things, requiring Plaintiffs and Class
18 Members to work through their lunch breaks, permitting and/or requiring Plaintiffs and Class
19 Members to take late lunch breaks, permitting and/or requiring Plaintiffs and Class Members to take
20 short lunch breaks, interrupting and/or allowing others to interrupt Plaintiffs and Class Members
21 during their lunch breaks, failing to relieve Plaintiffs and Class Members of all duties during their
22 lunch breaks, and restricting Plaintiffs and Class Members from leaving the premises during their
23 lunch breaks.

24 68. Further, because of Defendants' rounding policy, meal breaks were at times incorrectly
25 recorded as compliant, when in reality they were untimely and/or cut short.

26 69. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class
27 Members all meal period premiums due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7 and 512 and
28 the applicable IWC Wage Order. Defendants failed to include all required wages and remuneration,

1 including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary
2 performance pay, when calculating regular rates of pay for meal period premiums and/or merely using
3 straight time pay to calculate regular rates of pay for meal period premiums.

4 70. Defendants' conduct therefore violates the applicable IWC Wage Order and California
5 Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a), and 1198.

6 71. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section
7 226.7(b), Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants one
8 additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant meal
9 period was not provided as well as interest thereon.

10 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE § 226.7**

12 **Rest Break Violations**

13 **(Against All Defendants)**

14 72. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

15 73. California Labor Code section 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order govern
16 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members' employment by Defendants.

17 74. California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an
18 employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

19 75. The applicable IWC Wage Order provides that "[e]very employer shall authorize and
20 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each
21 work period" and that the "rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate
22 of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof" unless the total daily
23 work time is less than three and one-half (3½) hours."

24 76. Defendants routinely required Plaintiffs and the other Class Members to work three
25 and one-half (3 ½) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a compliant ten (10) minute rest
26 period per each four (4) hour period, or major fraction thereof, worked.

27 ///

28 ///

1 77. Moreover, Defendants willfully required, suffered, and permitted Plaintiffs and the
2 other Class Members to work during what should have been their rest periods. Defendants also failed
3 to relieve Plaintiffs and the other Class Members of all duties for ten (10) minutes as required for
4 compliant rest breaks.

5 78. As a result, Plaintiffs worked through rest periods, took late rest periods, took
6 interrupted rest periods, and/or took short rest periods, if at all.

7 79. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section
8 226.7(b), Plaintiffs and the other Class Members were entitled to recover from Defendants one (1)
9 additional hour of pay at their regular hourly rate of compensation for each workday that compliant
10 rest period(s) were not provided.

11 80. Defendants had no policy or practice to pay a premium when rest periods were missed,
12 short, late, and/or interrupted, or otherwise failed to comply with California law, and thus Defendants
13 failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members the full rest period premium due to them in
14 violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order. Defendants
15 failed to include all required wages and remuneration, including non-discretionary commissions, non-
16 discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary performance pay, when calculating regular rates of pay
17 for rest period premiums and/or merely using straight time pay to calculate regular rates of pay for rest
18 period premiums.

19 81. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections
20 226.7(c) and 1198, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants one
21 additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday compliant rest period(s)
22 were not provided as well as interest thereon.

23 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 204 AND 210**

25 **Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment**

26 **(Against All Defendants)**

27 82. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

28 ///

1 83. California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any
2 employment between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages
3 due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and 26th day of the month
4 during which the labor was performed.

5 84. California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any
6 employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those
7 wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of
8 the following month.

9 85. California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned for labor in excess
10 of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period.

11 86. As a result of the violations set forth in detail above (failure to pay overtime, failure to
12 pay minimum wages, meal break violations, and rest break violations), Defendants intentionally and
13 willfully failed to timely pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members all wages due to them within the
14 period permissible under California Labor Code section 204.

15 87. Further, Defendants failed to properly calculate the regular rate of pay by, *inter alia*,
16 excluding all required wages and remuneration including non-discretionary commissions, non-
17 discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary performance pay and/or merely using straight time pay
18 to calculate regular rates of pay for overtime, meal period premiums, or rest period premiums. By
19 doing so, Defendants violated California Labor Code section 204 by failing to comply with California
20 Labor Code sections 210, 510, 515, 551, 552, 558, 558.1, 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and tit.
21 8 CCR section 11040(5)(A)-(B), and the applicable IWC Wage Order. Plaintiffs and the other Class
22 Members are entitled to recover all available remedies for these violations including statutory penalties
23 pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210(b) and 1199.

24 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE § 226**

26 **Wage Statement Violations**

27 **(Against All Defendants)**

28 88. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

1 89. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code section 226(a) provides
2 that every employer shall furnish each of its employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing,
3 including, but not limited to, the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, total hours
4 worked, and all applicable hourly rates.

5 90. As a result of the violations set forth in detail above (failure to pay overtime, failure to
6 pay minimum wages, meal break violations, and rest break violations), Defendants intentionally and
7 willfully failed to provide Plaintiffs and the other Class Members with complete and accurate wage
8 statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to state all hours worked, the
9 failure to state the actual gross wages earned, the failure to include meal and rest break premiums, the
10 failure to include correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Defendants violated California Labor Code 226(a).

11 91. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 226, Plaintiffs
12 and the other Class Members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

13 92. Specifically, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members have been injured by Defendants'
14 intentional violation of California Labor Code section 226 because they were denied both their legal
15 right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving accurate, itemized wage statements under
16 California Labor Code section 226. In addition, because Defendants failed to provide the accurate
17 number of total hours worked on wage statements, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members have been
18 prevented by Defendants from determining if all hours worked were paid and the extent of the
19 underpayment. Plaintiffs had to file this lawsuit, and will further have to conduct discovery,
20 reconstruct time records, and perform computations in order to analyze whether in fact Plaintiffs and
21 the other Class Members were paid correctly and the extent of the underpayment, thereby causing
22 Plaintiffs to incur expenses and lost time. Plaintiffs would not have had to engage in these efforts and
23 incur these costs had Defendants provided the accurate number of total hours worked. This has also
24 delayed Plaintiffs' ability to demand and recover the underpayment of wages from Defendants.

25 93. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants the
26 greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code
27 section 226, or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000).

28 ///

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 201, 202, AND 203**

3 **Untimely Final Wages**

4 **(Against All Defendants)**

5 94. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

6 95. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203, Defendants are required
7 to timely pay all earned and unpaid wages to an employee who is discharged. California Labor Code
8 section 201 mandates that if an employer discharges an employee, the employee's wages accrued and
9 unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202
10 mandates that if an employee quits, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than
11 seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of
12 his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of
13 quitting.

14 96. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay,
15 in accordance with California Labor Code sections 201 and 202, any wages of an employee who is
16 discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date
17 thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is commenced; but the wages shall not
18 continue for more than thirty (30) days.

19 97. As a result of the violations set forth in detail above (failure to pay overtime, failure to
20 pay minimum wages, failure to properly calculate the regular rate of pay, meal break violations, and
21 rest break violations), at the time that Plaintiffs and the other Class Members' employment with
22 Defendants ended, Defendants knowingly and willfully failed to pay them all wages owed
23 to them pursuant to California Labor Code sections 201 and 202, including, without limitation,
24 overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages, and
25 all wages due to Plaintiffs and Class Members as they became due, as required per California Labor
26 Code section 204.

27 ///

28 ///

98. As a result, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to all available statutory penalties, including the waiting time penalties provided in California Labor Code section 203, together with interest thereon, as well as other available remedies including California Labor Code section 1199.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 2800 AND 2802

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses

(Against All Defendants)

99. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

100. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of the employee's job duties or in direct consequence of the employee's job duties or in direct consequence of the employee's obedience to the directions of the employer.

101. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants.

102. Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other Class Members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants their business-related expenses and costs incurred during the course and scope of employment, plus interest accrued from the date on which Plaintiffs and the other Class Members incurred the necessary expenditures at the same rate as judgments in civil actions in the State of California.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 233 and 245-249

Failure to Provide Sick Leave and Notice of Entitlement to Sick Leave

(Against All Defendants)

103. California Labor Code sections 233 and 245-249 provide protections regarding sick leave for California employees, including accrual of sick leave and notice that California employers must provide to their employees regarding sick leave. Among those, California Labor Code section

1 246(i) requires an employer to provide written notice about available sick leave, and states in relevant
2 part:

3 “An employer shall provide an employee with written notices that sets forth the
4 amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in
5 lieu of sick leave, for use on either the employee’s itemized wage statement described
6 in Section 226 or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the
7 employee’s payment of wages.”

8 104. Defendants failed to provide proper accrued sick leave to Plaintiffs and the other Class
9 Members, failed to pay sick pay at the regular rate, and failed to provide proper notice about accrued
10 sick leave. Accordingly, Defendants violated California Labor Code section 246.

11 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 227.3**

13 **Unpaid Vacation Time**

14 **(Against All Defendants)**

15 105. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in
16 all preceding paragraphs.

17 106. According to California Labor Code section 227.3, whenever a contract of employment
18 or employer policy provides for paid vacations, and an employee is terminated without having taken
19 off their vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to them as wages at their final rate in
20 accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time served.

21 107. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege that, at all relevant times
22 hereto, Defendants promulgated and maintained a uniform policy providing for paid vacation days,
23 and that Plaintiffs’ employment agreement with Defendants included paid vacations pursuant to
24 California Labor Code section 227.3.

25 108. For at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to present,
26 Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to provide Plaintiffs and Class Members within the
27 State of California with compensation at their final rate of pay for unused, vested paid vacation days
28 pursuant to California Labor Code section 227.3.

///

///

1 109. As a proximate result of Defendants' failure to pay vested vacation at the final rate of
2 Plaintiffs and Class Members upon their resignation or termination, Defendants violated California
3 Labor Code section 227.3, entitling Plaintiffs and Class Members to all vested and unused vacation
4 pay at their final rate of pay, as set out in Defendants' policy or contract of employment between
5 Plaintiffs and Class Members, on the one hand, and Defendants, on the other hand.

6 110. As a further proximate result of Defendants' above-described acts and/or omissions,
7 Plaintiffs and Class Members are entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and
8 prejudgment interest.

9 **TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **VIOLATION OF CAL. BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE §§ 17200, *ET. SEQ.***

11 **Unfair and Unlawful Business Practices**

12 **(Against All Defendants)**

13 111. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

14 112. Each and every one of Defendants' acts and omissions in violation of the California
15 Labor Code and/or the applicable IWC Wage Order as alleged in this Complaint, including but not
16 limited to Defendants' failure and refusal to pay overtime compensation, Defendants' failure and
17 refusal to pay minimum wages, Defendants' failure and refusal to provide required meal periods and/or
18 pay meal period premiums, Defendants' failure and refusal to provide required rest periods and/or pay
19 the required rest break premiums, Defendants' failure and refusal to timely pay wages at the correct
20 rate during employment, Defendants' failure and refusal to furnish accurate itemized wage statements,
21 Defendants' failure and refusal to reimburse business-related expenses and costs, and Defendants'
22 failure and refusal to timely pay wages upon termination constitutes unfair and unlawful business
23 practices under California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*

24 113. Defendants' violations of California wage and hour laws constitute unfair and unlawful
25 business practices because, among other things, they were done repeatedly over a significant period
26 of time, and in a systematic manner, to the detriment of Plaintiffs and the other Class Members.

27 ///

28 ///

114. Defendants have avoided payment of overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period premiums, rest period premiums, timely wages at the correct rate of pay, and other benefits as required by the California Labor Code, the California Code of Regulations, and the applicable IWC Wage Order. Further, Defendants have failed to record, report, and pay the correct sums of assessment to the state authorities under the California Labor Code and other applicable regulations.

115. As a result of Defendants' unfair and unlawful business practices, Defendants have reaped unfair and illegal profits during Plaintiffs and the other Class Members' tenure at the expense of Plaintiffs, the other Class Members, and members of the public. Defendants should be made to disgorge their ill-gotten gains and to restore them to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members.

116. Defendants' unfair and unlawful business practices entitle Plaintiffs and the other Class Members to seek preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, including but not limited to orders that Defendants account for, disgorge, and restore to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members the wages and other compensation unlawfully withheld from them. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to restitution of all monies to be disgorged from Defendants in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 2698, *ET SEQ.*

California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004

(Against All Defendants)

117. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

118. Plaintiff Giovacchini brings this action on a representative basis on behalf of other Aggrieved Employees and the State of California, in Plaintiff Giovacchini's capacity as a private attorney general pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, et seq.

119. PAGA expressly provides for a private right of action to recover civil penalties for violations of the California Labor Code as follows: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and

1 Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies,
2 or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action
3 brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former
4 employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.” Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(a).

5 120. Whenever the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
6 agencies, or employees has discretion to assess a civil penalty, a court in a civil action is authorized to
7 exercise the same discretion, subject to the same limitations and conditions, to assess a civil penalty.

8 121. Plaintiff Giovacchini and the other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees are “Aggrieved
9 Employees” as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or former
10 employees of Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations were committed against them.

11 122. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, violates numerous sections of the California
12 Labor Code, including, but not limited to, the following:

- 13 a. Violation of California Labor Code sections 204.3, 510, and 1198 for failure to pay
14 overtime wages, as set forth more fully above;
- 15 b. Violation of California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 for failure to pay
16 minimum wages, as set forth more fully above;
- 17 c. Violation of California Labor Code sections 204, 210, 510, 515, 551, 552, 558, 558.1,
18 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198, tit. 8 CCR section 11040(5)(A)-(B), and the
19 applicable IWC Wage Order for failure to calculate the regular rate of pay resulting in
20 unpaid wages, as set forth more fully above;
- 21 d. Violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) for failure to provide
22 legally required meal periods, as set forth more fully above;
- 23 e. Violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) for failure to pay
24 required meal period premiums, as set forth more fully above;
- 25 f. Violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 for failure to provide legally required
26 rest periods, as set forth more fully above;
- 27 g. Violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 for failure to pay required rest period
28 premiums, as set forth more fully above;

- h. Violation of California Labor Code section 204 for failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees during employment, as set forth more fully above;
- i. Violation of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 for failure to pay all wages at time of discharge from employment, as set forth more fully above;
- j. Violation of California Labor Code section 226 for failure to provide accurate wage statements to Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees, as set forth more fully above;
- k. Violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d) for failure to keep complete and accurate payroll records relating to Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees;
- l. Violation of California Labor Code sections 233 and 245-249 for failure to provide sick leave and provide notice of entitlement to sick leave;
- m. Violation of California Labor code section 227.3 for failure to pay accrued vacation pay to Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees; and
- n. Violation of California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees for necessary business-related expenses and costs, as set forth more fully above.

123. Pursuant to PAGA, and in particular California Labor Code sections 2699(a), 2699.3, and 2699.5, Plaintiff Giovacchini, acting in the public interest as a private attorney general, seeks assessment and collection of civil penalties for Plaintiff Giovacchini, all Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California against Defendants for violations of California Labor Code sections set forth herein, including penalties under California Labor Code sections 2699, 558, 210, 1197.1, 226, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 1199, and penalties under the applicable IWC Wage Order, and any and all additional penalties and remedies as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

124. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(i), civil penalties recovered by Aggrieved Employees shall be distributed as follows: sixty-five percent (65%) to the LWDA for the enforcement of labor laws and education of employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities and thirty-five (35%) to the Aggrieved Employees.

///

///

125. Plaintiff Giovacchini retained counsel to file this court action, and to assess and collect the civil penalties owed by Defendants. Plaintiff Giovacchini therefore seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210, 218.5, and 2699(g)(1), and any other applicable statute.

THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT 29 U.S.C. § 206

(Against All Defendants)

127. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

128. Pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”), 29 U.S.C. section 206, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members were entitled to receive minimum wages for all hours worked.

129. At all relevant times herein set forth, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members for all hours worked. This work was and is performed for the sole benefit of Defendants and was and is a uniform practice and policy in all Defendants' locations. This work resulted and continues to result in Plaintiffs and the other Class Members working without any compensation. As such, Defendants owe Plaintiffs and the other Class Members compensation for this work at least at a minimum wage rate.

130. At all relevant times herein set forth, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members minimum wages for all hours worked, as required by the FLSA, violated the provisions of the FLSA and was therefore unlawful. Moreover, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members' minimum wages was and is a result of a uniform policy or practice to deny them compensation at least at a minimum wage rate.

131. At all relevant times herein set forth, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members was the result of Defendants' willful, knowing, and intentional violation of the provisions of the FLSA, or alternatively, Defendants' reckless disregard for the requirements of those provisions. At all relevant times set forth, Defendants were aware that their uniform policies and practices are illegal, and that Plaintiffs and the other Class Members must be compensated for the work activities performed pursuant to these uniform policies and practices. Therefore, the foregoing

Defendants' conduct, as alleged, constitutes willful violation of the FLSA, within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. section 255(a).

132. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid minimum wages for all hours actually worked.

133. Pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. section 216(b), Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to recover the full amount of unpaid minimum wages as well as liquidated damages equal to the amount of unpaid compensation, interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT 29 U.S.C. § 207

(Against All Defendants)

134. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

135. The FLSA, 29 U.S.C. section 207(a)(1), provides in relevant part:

"Except as otherwise provided in this section, no employer shall employ any of his employees who in any workweek is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or is employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, for a workweek longer than forty hours unless such employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of the hours above specified at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed."

136. At all relevant times herein set forth, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members sometimes worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek; however, no overtime compensation was paid by Defendants and to the extent overtime compensation was paid, the overtime rate of pay was improperly calculated by Defendants. As such, Defendants owe Plaintiffs and the other Class Members overtime compensation.

137. At all relevant times herein set forth, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members the unpaid balance of overtime compensation, as required by the FLSA, violated the provisions of the FLSA and was therefore unlawful. Moreover, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs

1 and the other Class Members overtime compensation was and is a result of a uniform policy or practice
2 to deny overtime compensation to them.

3 138. At all relevant times herein set forth, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other
4 Class Members was the result of Defendants' willful, knowing, and intentional violation of the
5 provisions of the FLSA, or alternatively Defendants' reckless disregard for the requirements of those
6 provisions. At all relevant times herein set forth, Defendants were aware that their uniform policies
7 and practices are illegal and that Plaintiffs and the other Class Members must be compensated at the
8 correct overtime rate for work performed in excess of forty (40) hours pursuant to these uniform
9 policies and practices. Therefore, the foregoing Defendants' conduct, as alleged, constitutes willful
10 violation of the FLSA, within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. section 255(a).

11 139. Pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. section 216(b), Plaintiffs and the other Class Mmbers
12 are entitled to recover their unpaid overtime compensation as well as liquidated damages equal to the
13 amount of unpaid compensation, interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

14 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

15 Plaintiffs, on behalf of all others similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against
16 Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

17 **Class Certification**

- 18 1. That this action be certified as a class action;
19 2. That Plaintiff Crisafulli be appointed as the representative of the Class;
20 3. That counsel for Plaintiff Crisafulli be appointed as Class Counsel; and
21 4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel the names and most current/last known
22 contact information (addresses, e-mails, and telephone numbers) of all Class Members.

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

- 24 5. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor
25 Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiffs and the
26 other Class Members;

- 27 6. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

28 ///

1 7. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1 for
2 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members in the amount as may be established according to proof at trial;

3 8. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts
4 were due;

5 9. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California
6 Labor Code section 1194(a);

7 10. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2; and

8 11. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

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

10 12. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor
11 Code sections 204.3, 510, and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by willfully failing to pay
12 all overtime wages due to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members;

13 13. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages
14 as may be appropriate;

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

17 15. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California
18 Labor Code section 1194(a); and

19 16. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

20 **As to the Third Cause of Action**

21 17. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor
22 Code sections 226.7 and 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by willfully failing to provide all
23 meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members;

24 18. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(c);

25 19. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

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

27 21. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

28 22. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Fourth Cause Action

23. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by willfully failing to provide all rest periods to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members;

24. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(c);

25. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

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

27. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

28. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 204 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time required by California Labor Code section 204 to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members;

29. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 210; and

30. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

31. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the provisions of California Labor Code section 226 as to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to them;

32. For actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

33. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(e);

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

35. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

36. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment of Plaintiffs and the other Class Members no longer employed by

Defendants;

37. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

38. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for Plaintiffs and the other Class Members who have left Defendants' employ;

39. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date due; and

40. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

41. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other Class Members for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

42. For actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

43. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;

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

45. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

46. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants and, under California Labor Code sections 216 and 558.1, Defendants' owners, directors, officers, and/or managing agents, violated California Labor Code sections 233 and 245-249 by willfully failing to provide sick leave and notice of entitlement to sick leave to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members;

47. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

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

49. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Tenth Cause of Action

50. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 227.3 by willfully failing to pay wages for vested vacation time for Plaintiffs and the other Class Members whom are no longer employed by Defendants;

51. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

52. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for Plaintiffs and the other Class Members who have left Defendants' employ;

53. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts were due; and

54. For such other and further relief as the Cort may deem just and proper.

As to the Eleventh Cause of Action

55. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the following California Labor Code sections as to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members: 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 (by failing to pay minimum wages); 204.3, 510 and 1198 (by failing to pay overtime wages); 226.7 and 512(a) (by failing to provide meal and rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof); 204 (by failing to timely pay wages during employment); 226(a) (by failing to provide accurate wage statements); 201, 202, and 203 (by failing to pay all wages owed upon termination); and 2800 and 2802 (by failing to reimburse business-related expenses);

56. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiffs and all the other Class Members and all pre-judgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

57. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage, and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a result of violation of California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*;

58. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5; and

59. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*

As to the Twelfth Cause of Action

60. For the imposition of civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699, 210, 558, 226, 226.3, 1174.5, and 1197.1, and all other penalties allowed by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes;

61. For statutory attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to sections 210, 218.5, and 2699(g)(1) of the California Labor Code; and

62. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

As to the Thirteenth Cause of Action

63. For general unpaid minimum wages;

64. For liquidated damages equal to the amount of unpaid compensation;

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

66. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. section 216(b); and

67. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Fourteenth Cause of Action

68. For general and unpaid wages at overtime wage rates;

69. For liquidated damages equal to the amount of unpaid compensation;

70. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation from the date such amounts were due;

71. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. section 216(b); and

72. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: October 23, 2025

BLACKSTONE LAW, APC

By:



Karen I. Gold, Esq.

Sara Pezeshkpour, Esq.

Noam Reiffman, Esq.

Marissa A. Mayhood, Esq.

Alexandra Rose, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiff ARIANA CRISAFULLI, individually, and on behalf of other similarly situated employees and GINA MARIE GIOVACCHINI, individually, and on behalf of aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

Dated: October 23, 2025

Karen I. Gold, Esq.
Sara Pezeshkpour, Esq.
Noam Reiffman, Esq.
Marissa A. Mayhood, Esq.
Alexandra Rose, Esq.

FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT

EXHIBIT A

September 12, 2024

PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission

California Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)

Sacramento, CA 95814

<https://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html>

RE: *Gina Marie Giovacchini v. Sonoma Media Investments*

To Whom It May Concern:

This office represents Gina Marie Giovacchini (“Claimant”) with respect to their claims under the California Labor Code against Sonoma Media Investments, LLC (including all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers) (collectively referred to herein as “Employers”). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail.

Employers employed Gina Marie Giovacchini from approximately June 2013 to August 2024 as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee. Gina Marie Giovacchini worked as a Senior Credit Analyst for Employers and was based out of Employers’ facility located at 416 B Street, Suite C, Santa Rosa, CA 95401.

Claimant intends to bring a representative action seeking penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”). Claimant is seeking penalties on behalf of themselves and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Employers in the State of California during the relevant statutory period who suffered the violations alleged (“Aggrieved Employees”). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3 and shall serve as Claimant’s notice of the provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories in support thereof.

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California’s wage and hour laws during Claimant’s employment, including but not limited to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order (“IWC Wage Order”). Employers’ conduct giving rise to the violations detailed below was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive

within the meaning of PAGA.

The claims made on behalf of Claimant and Aggrieved Employees are based upon the following facts and theories:

1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Employers engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 and the applicable IWC Wage Order require employers to pay at least the legal minimum wage to their employees. California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order further require employers to pay no less than one and one-half times an employee's regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek, and to pay no less than twice an employee's regular rate of pay of the employee for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a workweek.

Throughout the relevant time, Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock. Employers failed to compensate Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law. Employers fraudulently adjusted Claimant's and other Aggrieved Employees' timesheets to avoid paying them for all time worked.

This uncompensated work often resulted in the total number of hours worked by Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees exceeding the daily and/or weekly triggers for overtime wages, yet Employers failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees applicable overtime rate(s) for these hours. Employers fraudulently adjusted Claimant's and other Aggrieved Employees' timesheets and/or required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to "clock out" but continue working to avoid paying them proper overtime compensation.

Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Claimant and Aggrieved Employees. In addition, Employers utilized time rounding practices that resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages (including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages) to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees.

Employers also failed to pay overtime to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration, including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary performance pay.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employers failed to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

2. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to provide employees with an opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the fifth hour of work when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512(a). Employers must provide a second meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the tenth hour of work when an employee works more than ten (10) hours in a day. *Id.* For each day that an employer fails to provide compliant meal period(s), the employer must pay the employee a meal penalty equal to one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. *Id.*

During the relevant time period, Employers failed to provide Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant 30-minute meal periods. Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were required by Employers to work more than five (5) hours per day but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5th) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10th) hour of work. Meal breaks, when provided, were oftentimes interrupted and/or cut short.

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded their own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods; and

(7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on maximizing profits over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a compliant meal period was not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a) and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

3. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to authorize and permit employees to take an uninterrupted rest period of no less than ten (10) minutes for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof, worked. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7. For each day that an employer fails to authorize and permit a compliant rest period, the employer owes the employee one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7(c).

Employers failed to authorize and permit Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a rest period was not provided to them in compliance with California law. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, Employers willfully and intentionally failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

California Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish wage statements to its employees setting forth, *inter alia*, (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units

earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, and (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer.

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock), the actual gross wages earned (including wages owed for time spent working off the clock and meal and rest period premiums), and the correct rates of pay. Employers' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements was knowing and intentional. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. The applicable IWC Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Claimant and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION

California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

During the relevant time period, upon the termination of employment (including but not limited to when they were temporarily laid off, laid off, discharged, and/or resigned), Employers failed to pay all wages due to their employees within twenty-four (24) hours of termination or even within seventy-two (72) hours for those who resigned. Specifically, as a result of Employers' practices of requiring Claimant and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, unlawful rounding practices, failure to properly calculate regular rates, and failure to accurately record all hours actually worked, Employers failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all straight time wage, minimum wages and overtime compensation owed to them upon termination of their employment. Employers also failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for meal period premiums and rest period premiums they were owed, amongst other wages. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

9. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL ACCRUED VACATION AND HOLIDAY WAGES

Labor Code § 227.3 requires employers to pay separating employees all accrued vacation pay. "The right to a paid vacation, when offered in an employer's policy or contract of employment, constitutes deferred wages for services rendered. Case law from this state and others, as well as principles of equity and justice, compel the conclusion that a proportionate right to a paid vacation 'vests' as the labor is rendered. Once vested, the right is protected from forfeiture by section 227.3. On termination of employment, therefore, the statute requires that an employee be paid in wages for a pro rata share of his vacation pay." *Suastez v. Plastic Dress-Up Co.* (1982) 31 Cal.3d 774, 784. Under California law, vacation plans may not have a use-it-or-lose-it forfeiture policy. *Henry v. Amrol* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1.

During the relevant time period, Employers failed to compensate Claimant and the

Aggrieved Employees with all vested vacation time as wages including upon separation in violation of California Labor Code section 227.3.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203; interest; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

10. CONCLUSION

Claimant hereby provides notice to the LWDA under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq.*, and specifically asks for an investigation, or if the agency does not intend to investigate the alleged violations, a letter confirming the same so that Claimant may allege a cause of action under PAGA against Employers for the violations discussed in this letter.

This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3. By law, an employee alleging a violation of one of the above referenced sections must notify his or her employer and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) before he or she can invoke the provisions of Sections 2699, *et seq.*, by seeking redress in court. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(1). The LWDA must then notify the employer and the employee within 60 calendar days regarding whether it intends to investigate the alleged violation. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(B). If the LWDA advises it will not investigate, or if no notice is provided within 65 calendar days, the employee may file a lawsuit invoking the provisions under Labor Code § 2699. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A). It is Claimant's intention to file a civil complaint and to bring the appropriate claims under California Labor Code § 2699 on behalf of themselves, the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees should your office not address Employers' alleged violations within this timeframe.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact my office. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

BLACKSTONE LAW

Karen Gold
Karen I. Gold, Esq.

cc: By U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Sonoma Media Investments, LLC
Attn: Vern Zander, Agent for Service
416 B Street, Suite C
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

EXHIBIT B



8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

Karen I. Gold, Esq.
kgold@blackstonepc.com

July 22, 2025

Amended PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission

California Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)

Sacramento, CA 95814

<https://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html>

RE: *Gina Marie Giovacchini v. Sonoma Media Investments, LWDA Case No. LWDA-CM-1050318-24*

To Whom It May Concern:

On September 12, 2024, pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”), our office provided notice to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) on behalf of Gina Marie Giovacchini (“Claimant”) that Claimant intends to bring a representative action seeking penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under PAGA with respect to their claims under the California Labor Code against Sonoma Media Investments, LLC (including all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers) (collectively referred to herein as “Employers”). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail.

We write to inform you of this amended notice.

Employers employed Claimant from approximately June 2013 to August 2024 as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee. Claimant worked as a Senior Credit Analyst for Employers and was based out of Employers’ facility located at 416 B Street, Suite C, Santa Rosa, CA 95401.

Claimant is seeking penalties on behalf of herself and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Employers in the State of California during the relevant statutory period who suffered the violations alleged (“Aggrieved Employees”). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3 and shall serve as Claimant’s notice of the provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories in support thereof.

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California's wage and hour laws during Claimant's employment, including but not limited to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 204.3, 210, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 233, 245-249, 510, 512(a), 515, 551, 552, 558, 558.1, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2699, 2800, and 2802, tit. 8 CCR 11040(5)(A)-(B), and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order ("IWC Wage Order"). Employers' conduct giving rise to the violations detailed below was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive within the meaning of PAGA.

The claims made on behalf of Claimant and Aggrieved Employees are based upon the following facts and theories:

1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Employers engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 and the applicable IWC Wage Order require employers to pay at least the legal minimum wage to their employees. California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order further require employers to pay no less than one and one-half times an employee's regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek, and to pay no less than twice an employee's regular rate of pay of the employee for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a workweek.

Throughout the relevant time, Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock. Employers failed to compensate Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law. Employers fraudulently adjusted Claimant's and other Aggrieved Employees' timesheets to avoid paying them for all time worked.

This uncompensated work often resulted in the total number of hours worked by Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees exceeding the daily and/or weekly triggers for overtime wages, yet Employers failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees applicable overtime rate(s) for these hours. Employers fraudulently adjusted Claimant's and other Aggrieved Employees' timesheets and/or required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to "clock out" but continue working to avoid paying them proper overtime compensation.

Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Claimant and Aggrieved Employees. In addition, Employers utilized time rounding practices that resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages (including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime

wages) to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees.

Employers also failed to pay overtime to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration, including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary performance pay.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employers failed to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 204, 204.3, 210, 510, 515, 551, 552, 558, 558.1, 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198, tit. 8 CCR § 11040(5)(A)-(B), and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1199, and the aforementioned California Labor Code sections; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

2. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to provide employees with an opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the fifth hour of work when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512(a). Employers must provide a second meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the tenth hour of work when an employee works more than ten (10) hours in a day. *Id.* For each day that an employer fails to provide compliant meal period(s), the employer must pay the employee a meal penalty equal to one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. *Id.*

During the relevant time period, Employers failed to provide Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant 30-minute meal periods. Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were required by Employers to work more than five (5) hours per day but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5th) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10th) hour of work. Meal breaks, when provided, were oftentimes interrupted and/or cut short.

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded their own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various

levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on maximizing profits over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a compliant meal period was not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a), and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

3. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to authorize and permit employees to take an uninterrupted rest period of no less than ten (10) minutes for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof, worked. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7. For each day that an employer fails to authorize and permit a compliant rest period, the employer owes the employee one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7(c).

Employers failed to authorize and permit Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a rest period was not provided to them in compliance with California law. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, Employers willfully and intentionally failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Further, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204 by failing to comply with California Labor Code sections 510 (overtime provision), 515 (overtime provision), 551 and 552 (employee entitled to one day of rest out of seven), 558, 558.1, 1182.12 (minimum wage provision), 1194 (minimum wage provision), 1197 (minimum wage provision), 1197.1 (minimum wage provision), and 1198 (maximum hours worked), and tit. 8 CCR § 11040(5)(A)-(B) (overtime provision) as discussed throughout this letter.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

California Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish wage statements to its employees setting forth, *inter alia*, (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, and (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer.

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock), the actual gross wages earned (including wages owed for time spent working off the clock and meal and rest period premiums), and the correct rates of pay. Employers' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements was knowing and intentional. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and

California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. The applicable IWC Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Claimant and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION

California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

During the relevant time period, upon the termination of employment (including but not limited to when they were temporarily laid off, laid off, discharged, and/or resigned), Employers failed to pay all wages due to their employees within twenty-four (24) hours of termination or even within seventy-two (72) hours for those who resigned. Specifically, as a result of Employers' practices of requiring Claimant and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, unlawful rounding practices, failure to properly calculate regular rates, and failure to accurately record all hours actually worked, Employers failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all straight time wage, minimum wages and overtime compensation owed to them upon termination of their employment. Employers also failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for meal period premiums and rest period premiums they were owed, amongst other wages. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

9. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL ACCRUED VACATION AND HOLIDAY WAGES

California Labor Code section 227.3 requires employers to pay separating employees all accrued vacation pay. "The right to a paid vacation, when offered in an employer's policy or contract of employment, constitutes deferred wages for services rendered. Case law from this state and others, as well as principles of equity and justice, compel the conclusion that a proportionate right to a paid vacation 'vests' as the labor is rendered. Once vested, the right is protected from forfeiture by section 227.3. On termination of employment, therefore, the statute requires that an employee be paid in wages for a pro rata share of his vacation pay." *Suastez v. Plastic Dress-Up Co.* (1982) 31 Cal.3d 774, 784. Under California law, vacation plans may not have a use-it-or-lose-it forfeiture policy. *Henry v. Amrol* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1.

During the relevant time period, Employers failed to compensate Claimant and the Aggrieved Employees with all vested vacation time as wages including upon separation in violation of California Labor Code section 227.3.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203; interest; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

10. VIOLATIONS REGARDING CALIFORNIA SICK LEAVE/SICK PAY LAWS

California Labor Code section 233 and 245--249 provide protections regarding sick leave for California employees, including accrual of sick leave and notice that California employers must provide to their employees regarding sick leave. Among those, California Labor Code section 246(i) requires an employer to provide written notice about available sick leave, and states in relevant part:

"An employer shall provide an employee with written notices that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either the employee's itemized wage statement described in Section 226 or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee's payment of wages."

Employers failed to provide proper accrued sick leave to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees, failed to pay sick pay at the regular rate of pay, and failed to provide proper notice about accrued sick leave. Therefore, Employers violated California Labor Code sections 233 and 245-249.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to the relevant California Labor Code section including section 248.5; all available equitable and injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

11. CONCLUSION

This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3. By law, an employee alleging a violation of one of the above referenced sections must notify his or her employer and the LWDA before he or she can invoke the provisions of California Labor Code sections 2699, *et seq.*, by seeking redress in court. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(1). The LWDA must then notify the employer and the employee within 60 calendar days regarding whether it intends to investigate the alleged violation. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(B). If the LWDA advises it will not investigate, or if no notice is provided within 65 calendar days, the employee may file a lawsuit invoking the provisions under California Labor Code section 2699. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A).

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact my office. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

BLACKSTONE LAW



Karen I. Gold, Esq.

cc: By E-Mail and U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Elizabeth Staggs Wilson (estaggs-wilson@littler.com)

Chad Greeson (cgreeson@littler.com)

Gonzalo Morales (gmorales@littler.com)

LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.

1255 Treat Blvd., Suite 600

Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Attorneys for Sonoma Media Investments, LLC

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SONOMA

I, Lorena Bautista, certify and declare as follows:

I am over eighteen years of age and not a party to the within action; my business address is 8383 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 745, Beverly Hills, California 90211. On October 23, 2025, I served a copy of the following document(s):

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

on the interested parties as follows:

Elizabeth Staggs Wilson, Esq.

Chad Greeson, Esq.

LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.

1255 Treat Blvd., Suite 600

Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Tel: (925) 927-4507 Fax: (925) 946-9809

Emails: CGreeson@littler.com;

EStaggs-Wilson@littler.com;

KJu@littler.com;

JRSmith@littler.com;

KRamirez@littler.com

Attorney for Defendants SONOMA MEDIA INVESTMENTS, LLC

☒ **BY ELECTRONIC MAIL (E-MAIL):** I caused said document(s) to be delivered electronically to be delivered to the above referenced addressee(s) via email from email address lbautista@blackstonepc.com pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6(e)(1). I did not receive any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

State of California, Labor & Workforce Development Agency

Web URL:

<http://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html>

☒ **BY ONLINE SUBMISSION:** The above-referenced documents were transmitted to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency through the online system established for the submission of notices and documents, in conformity with California Labor Code section 2699(I). I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

1 ☒

STATE:

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

Executed on October 23, 2025 at Beverly Hills, California.

/s/ Lorena Bautista
Lorena Bautista