

Electronically Filed  
3/24/2025 7:31 PM  
Superior Court of California  
County of Stanislaus  
Clerk of the Court  
By: Erin Barnett, Deputy

Thiago M. Coelho, SBN 324715  
*thiago.coelho@wilshirelawfirm.com*  
Lauren Lendzion, SBN 239184  
*lauren.lendzion@wilshirelawfirm.com*  
Jesenia A. Martinez, SBN 316969  
*jesenia.martinez@wilshirelawfirm.com*  
Jesse S. Chen, SBN 336294  
*jesse.chen@wilshirelawfirm.com*  
**WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC**  
3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90010  
Telephone: (213) 381-9988  
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

*Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Class*

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

ED SENOR, individually, and on behalf of all  
others similarly situated, and on behalf of the  
State of California and other aggrieved persons,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

CRIMETEK SECURITY INC., a California  
Corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,  
inclusive,

*Defendants.*

Case No.: CV-24-008783

**CLASS & PAGA REPRESENTATIVE  
ACTION**

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Judge: Hon. John R. Mayne  
Dept.: 21

Complaint Filed: October 30, 2024  
Trial Date: Not Yet Set

1 Plaintiff Ed Senior (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,  
2 and on behalf of the State of California and other aggrieved persons, on information and belief,  
3 alleges as follows:

4 **I. INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff sues Defendant Crimetek Security Inc. (“Crimetek”), and DOES 1 through  
6 10 (collectively, “Defendants”) for California Labor Code violations and unfair business practices.  
7 The claims stem from Defendants’ failure to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time,  
8 and overtime wages), failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods,  
9 failure to furnish accurate wage statements, and failure to indemnify employees for expenditures.

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

16 3. Plaintiff brings the Tenth Cause of Action individually and on behalf of the  
17 Aggrieved Employees, meaning all persons who worked for Defendants in California as hourly  
18 paid or non-exempt employees during the statute of limitations period applicable to the claim  
19 pleaded herein.

20 4. Defendants own and operate an industry, business, and establishment within the  
21 State of California, including Stanislaus County. As such and based on all the facts and  
22 circumstances incident to Defendants’ business in California, Defendants are subject to the  
23 California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC), and the  
24 California Business and Professions Code.

25 5. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period, Defendants have, at  
26 times:

1 (a) Failed to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum,  
2 straight time, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage  
3 Orders;

4 (b) Failed to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in  
5 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failed to maintain accurate  
6 records of all meal periods taken or missed, and failed to pay an extra hour's pay for each workday  
7 a meal period violation occurred;

8 (c) Failed to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest  
9 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, and failed to pay an  
10 extra hour's pay for each workday a rest period violation occurred;

11 (d) Failed to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements  
12 containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;

13 (e) Failed to indemnify employees for expenditures incurred in direct discharge  
14 of duties of employment; and

15 (f) Willfully failed to pay employees all minimum wage, straight time wages,  
16 overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages due within the time  
17 period specified by California law when employment terminates;

18 (g) Failed to timely produce requested employment records to employees as  
19 required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

20 6. On information and belief, Defendants were on actual and constructive notice of the  
21 improprieties alleged above and intentionally refused to rectify their unlawful conduct.  
22 Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times were willful and deliberate.

23 7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all the  
24 unlawful conduct, policies, acts and omissions as described in the foregoing paragraphs as the  
25 employers of Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants are  
26 responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of under the doctrine of  
27 respondeat superior.  
28

1     **II.     THE PARTIES**

2             **A.     Plaintiff**

3             8.     Plaintiff, a resident of Modesto, California, worked for Defendants in Stanislaus  
4     County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately September 5,  
5     2016 to approximately August 15, 2024.

6             9.     Plaintiff reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new  
7     plaintiffs, if necessary, to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v. American*  
8     *Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

9             **B.     Defendants**

10            10.    Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based on that information and belief alleges,  
11    that Crimetek is, and at all times mentioned here, was:

12               (a)    A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the  
13    State of California, including Stanislaus County; and,

14               (b)    The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer of  
15    the putative Class and Aggrieved Employees because Crimetek permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and  
16    the Aggrieved Employees to work; and/or exercised control over their wages, hours, or working  
17    conditions; and/or engaged Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees, thereby creating a  
18    common law employment relationship.

19            11.    Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued  
20    herein as DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious  
21    names. Each of the DOE Defendants was in some way legally responsible for the damages suffered  
22    by Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged. Plaintiff will amend this complaint  
23    to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained,  
24    together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

25            12.    At all times mentioned here, Defendants named as DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,  
26    and each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of,  
27    and/or injured a significant number of the Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in the  
28    State of California.

13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times each Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and the other employees described in the class definitions below, and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, joint employer, officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or predecessor in interest of some or all the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all the other Defendants to be liable for their conduct in the matters alleged below. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted under and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided, and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

### III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

14. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under California Code of Civil Procedure section 410.10.

15. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because Plaintiff's and Class Members' claims arise out of Defendants' business activities conducted in the State of California.

16. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, inclusive, and each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or injured Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in the State of California.

17. Venue is appropriate in Stanislaus, California because many of the acts and omissions that give rise to the claims for relief alleged took place in Stanislaus County.

### IV. ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

18. Plaintiff worked for Defendants in Stanislaus County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately September 5, 2016 to approximately August 15, 2024. During Plaintiff's employment for Defendants, Defendants paid Plaintiff an hourly wage and classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from overtime.

1           19. Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendants, at times, failed to pay Plaintiff for  
2 all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failed to provide  
3 Plaintiff with legally compliant meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take rest  
4 periods, failed to furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, and failed to indemnify Plaintiff  
5 for expenditures.

6           20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants, at times, maintained a policy and  
7 practice of not paying Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked,  
8 including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Defendants would, at times, manufacture  
9 time keeping records to falsely show that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees took  
10 meal periods when in fact they worked "off-the-clock," uncompensated. The effect is that Plaintiff,  
11 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees worked through meal and rest periods "off-the-clock."  
12 Defendants paid Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees less than all their work time.  
13 Some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours  
14 worked, Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff, the Class, and  
15 the Aggrieved Employees worked.

16           21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff,  
17 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants required  
18 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five straight hours a day  
19 without providing a 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period for every five hours of  
20 work, or without compensating Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all missed  
21 meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work.  
22 Instead, Defendants continued to assert control over Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved  
23 Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not  
24 be completed without working rather than take mandatory meal periods, or by denying Plaintiff,  
25 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a meal period. As described above,  
26 Defendants would manufacture time keeping records to falsely show that Plaintiff, the Class, and  
27 the Aggrieved Employees took meal periods by the fifth hour of work or took meal periods when  
28 in fact they worked "off-the-clock," uncompensated. Accordingly, Defendants failed to provide

meal periods to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

22. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have, at times, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest periods. Defendants required Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four straight hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Instead, Defendants continued to assert control over Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working rather than take mandatory rest periods, or by denying Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a rest period. Accordingly, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

23. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed, at times, to furnish Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law). As a result of these violations of California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), the Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

(a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid minimum wage, straight time wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages, even though they were entitled;

(b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum wage, straight time wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages, even though they had not been;

(c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum wage, straight time wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they were entitled;

(d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum wage, straight time wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they had not been;

(e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum wage, straight time wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages owed to them;

(f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage statements contained the required accurate information;

(g) by understating the wages truly due to them, the violations caused them to lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;

(h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wage rates to which Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled, and Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

Thus, Plaintiff and the Class are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e).

24. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully required Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants. Plaintiff and the Class paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses.

25. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully required Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of

1 their duties for Defendants. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees paid out-of-pocket  
2 for necessary employment-related expenses.

3 26. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees incurred substantial expenses as  
4 a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendants, but Defendants failed to indemnify  
5 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

6 27. Plaintiff and some of the Class incurred substantial expenses as a direct result of  
7 performing their job duties for Defendants, but Defendants failed to indemnify Plaintiff and some  
8 of the Class for these employment-related expenses.

9 28. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants, at times, willfully failed and refused  
10 to timely pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all final wages due at their  
11 termination of employment. In addition, Plaintiff's final paychecks did not include payment for all  
12 expenditures, minimum wage, straight time wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages,  
13 and rest period premium wages owed to Plaintiff by Defendants at the conclusion of Plaintiff's  
14 employment. On information and belief, Defendants' failure to timely pay Plaintiff's final wages  
15 when Plaintiff's employment was terminated was not a single, isolated incident, but was instead  
16 consistent with Defendants' practices that applied, at times, to Plaintiff, the Class, and the  
17 Aggrieved Employees.

18 29. Plaintiff sent written requests through Plaintiff's counsel to Defendants for  
19 Plaintiff's personnel file, pay records, wage statements, timekeeping records, and other  
20 employment-related documents pursuant to Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. However,  
21 Defendants failed to timely produce the requested employment records, in violation of Labor Code  
22 sections 226 and 1198.5.

23 **V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

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

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

32. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

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

33. At all material times, Plaintiff was a member of the Class.

34. Plaintiff undertakes this concerted activity to improve the wages and working conditions of all Class Members.

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

(a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical. The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 40 individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' records.

(b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) are typical of all Class Members' claims.

(c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims. Plaintiff has no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class Member. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each Class Member.

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

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

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

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

- (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages;
- (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class Members;
- (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages to Class Members;
- (d) Failed to provide Class Members with timely final wages;
- (e) Failed to provide Class Members with accurate wage statements;

(f) Failed to indemnify Class Members for expenditures;  
(g) Failed to produce requested employment records; and  
(h) Violated California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*  
as a result of their illegal conduct as described above.

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

(a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any question affecting only individual Class Members;

(b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the Class Members;

(c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the Class before the Court;

(d) Plaintiff, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a class action;

(e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries for which Defendants are responsible in an amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the Class for the injuries sustained;

(f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Class would create a risk of:

(1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or,

(2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including but not

limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,

(g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to the Class as a whole.

38. Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. Defendants' own business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiff contemplates the use of additional techniques and forms common in class actions, such as published notice, email notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by other methods suitable to the Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

## **VI. CAUSES OF ACTION**<sup>1</sup>

### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **(Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages for All Hours Worked)**

39. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated here paragraphs 1 through 38 in this Complaint.

40. "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

41. At all relevant times mentioned, Defendants, at times, knowingly failed to pay to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees compensation for all hours they worked. By their failure to pay compensation for each hour worked as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code section 1194, and any additional applicable Wage Orders, which require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

42. Accordingly, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover minimum and straight time wages for all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise stated, Plaintiff asserts all causes of action against all Defendants.

43. By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have been deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned through their employment with Defendants.

44. By virtue of the Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for their non-overtime hours worked without pay, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees, and which will be determined according to proof at trial.

45. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage compensation due Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

46. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover liquidated damages (double damages) for Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages.

47. California Labor Code section 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at rates required by law, including minimum and straight time wages. However, Defendants failed and refused to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all such wages due and failed to pay those wages twice a month.

48. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to seek recovery of all unpaid minimum and straight time wages, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under California Labor Code sections 218.5, 218.6, and 1194, subdivision (a).

## **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

### **(Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)**

49. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated here paragraphs 1 through 48 in this Complaint.

1           50. California Labor Code section 510 provides that employees in California shall not  
2 be employed more than eight hours in any workday or 40 hours in a workweek unless they receive  
3 additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

4           51. California Labor Code sections 1194 and 1198 provide that employees in California  
5 shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional  
6 compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, California  
7 Labor Code section 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those  
8 fixed by the IWC is unlawful.

9           52. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have,  
10 at times, worked more than eight hours in a workday and/or more than 40 hours in a workweek, as  
11 employees of Defendants.

12           53. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the  
13 Aggrieved Employees overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the  
14 maximum hours permissible by law as required by California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.

15           54. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional premium rate  
16 compensation to the Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for their overtime hours  
17 worked, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered, and will continue to  
18 suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to them, but which exceed the  
19 jurisdictional minimum of this Court and which will be determined according to proof at trial.

20           55. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code section  
21 1174 subdivision (d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime  
22 compensation due to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

23           56. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees also request recovery of overtime  
24 compensation according to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs under California Labor Code  
25 section 1194, subdivision (a), as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against  
26 Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

27           57. California Labor Code section 204 requires employers to provide employees with  
28 all wages due and payable twice a month. The Wage Orders also provide that every employer shall

1 pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime wages for all  
2 overtime hours worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff, the Class, and  
3 the Aggrieved Employees with all compensation due, in violation of California Labor Code section  
4 204.

5 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**  
6 **(Failure to Provide Meal Periods)**

7 58. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated here paragraphs  
8 1 through 57 in this Complaint.

9 59. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the  
10 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of all duties in order to take their first daily meal  
11 periods no later than at the end of Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees' fifth hour of  
12 work in a workday, and to take their second meal periods no later than at the end of the tenth hour  
13 of work in the workday. California Labor Code section 512, and section 11 of the applicable Wage  
14 Orders require that an employer provide unpaid meal periods of at least thirty minutes for each  
15 five-hour period worked. It violates California Labor Code section 226.7 for an employer to require  
16 any employee to work during any meal period mandated under any Wage Order.

17 60. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants, at times, failed to provide Plaintiff  
18 and some, but not necessarily all of the Class with both meal periods as required by California law.  
19 By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take  
20 all meal periods as alleged above (or because Defendants, at times, made it impossible or  
21 impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods), Defendants willfully violated the  
22 provisions of California Labor Code section 226.7 and the applicable Wage Orders.

23 61. Under California law, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled  
24 to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required  
25 meal period(s), plus interest.

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods)**

62. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-allege as if fully stated here paragraphs 1 through 61 in this Complaint.

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

64. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants at times failed to authorize Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked more than four hours in a workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods as alleged above (or because Defendants, at times, made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code section 226.7 and the applicable Wage Orders.

65. Under California law, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to be paid one hour of premium wages rate for each workday they were not provided with all required rest break(s), plus interest.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees – Waiting Time Penalties)**

66. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 65 in this Complaint.

1           67.       At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 provide  
2 that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge  
3 are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment,  
4 his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the  
5 employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the  
6 employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

7           68.       Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of many other Class  
8 Members ended, i.e., was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will  
9 be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendant, at times, failed, and continue to fail, to  
10 pay the terminated Class Members, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by California  
11 Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within 72 hours of their leaving  
12 Defendants' employ.

13           69.       Defendants' failure to pay the Class Members who are no longer employed by  
14 Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within 72 hours of their  
15 leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

16           70.       California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to  
17 pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall  
18 continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is  
19 commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days.

20           71.       Pursuant to California Labor Code section 203, the Class is entitled to recover from  
21 Defendants their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular  
22 hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum.

23           72.       Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, the Class is also  
24 entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs incurred in this  
25 action.  
26  
27  
28

**SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and Compliant Wage Records)**

73. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated here paragraphs 1 through 72 in this Complaint.

74. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (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 the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

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

76. As a result of Defendants’ violation of California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

77. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have been injured by Defendants’ intentional violation of California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) because Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage statements under California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

1           78.     Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved  
2 Employees is difficult and time consuming. Because of this unlawful burden, Plaintiff, the Class,  
3 and the Aggrieved Employees were also injured as a result of having to sue to try to obtain correct  
4 wage information following Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the mandates of  
5 California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

6           79.     Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from  
7 Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with  
8 California Labor Code section 226, subdivision(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000  
9 per employee.

10          80.     Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to injunctive  
11 relief, as well as an award of attorney's fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, under  
12 California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (h).

13                                   **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14                                   **(Failure to Indemnify Employees for Expenditures)**

15          81.     Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated here paragraphs  
16 1 through 80 in this Complaint.

17          82.     As set forth above, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees needed to  
18 incur substantial necessary expenditures and losses as a direct consequence of the discharge of  
19 their duties or of their obedience to directions of Defendants.

20          83.     Defendants violated California Labor Code section 2802, by failing to pay and  
21 indemnify Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for necessary expenditures and losses  
22 as a direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of  
23 Defendants.

24          84.     As a result, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were damaged at least  
25 in the amounts of the expenses they paid, or which were deducted by Defendants from their wages.

26          85.     Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to reasonable  
27 attorney's fees, expenses, and costs of suit under California Labor Code section 2802, subdivision  
28 (c) and interest under California Labor Code section 2802, subdivision (b).

**EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Failure to Produce Requested Employment Records)**

86. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated here paragraphs 1 through 85 in this Complaint.

87. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 226, current and former employees have the right to inspect or receive a copy of their records relating to their employment, upon reasonable request to their employer. Under this statute, an employer that receives a request to inspect or receive a copy of records relating to a current or former employee must comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than 21 calendar days from the date of the request.

88. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1198.5, subdivision (a), every current and former employee, or his or her representative, has the right to inspect and receive a copy of the personnel records that the employer maintains relating to the employee's performance or to any grievance concerning the employee. Under this statute, upon written request from a current or former employee or his or her representative, an employer must make the contents of those personnel records available for inspection or provide a copy of the personnel records to the current or former employee, or his or her representative, not later than 30 calendar days from the date the employer receives the written request, subject to some limited exceptions. Failure to comply with these requests allows for a civil penalty seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750), under Labor Code section 1198.5, subdivision (k) and 226, subdivision (f).

89. As explained above, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are current and former employees of Defendants.

90. Plaintiff sent a written request through Plaintiff's counsel to Defendants for Plaintiff's personnel file, pay records, wage statements, timekeeping records, and other employment-related documents pursuant to Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. However, Defendants failed to timely produce the requested employment records.

91. Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226, and 1198.5 by failing to timely produce the required records requested by Plaintiff.

1           92.     On information and belief, Defendants’ failure to provide Plaintiff with Plaintiff’s  
2 requested employment records is not an isolated incident but was instead consistent with  
3 Defendants’ practice that applied to Plaintiff and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class.

4           93.     Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1198.5, Plaintiff and some of, but not  
5 necessarily all of, the Class are entitled to a penalty of seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750) from  
6 Defendants, injunctive relief in the form of compliance with section 1198.5, and attorneys’ fees  
7 and costs.

8           94.     Pursuant to California Labor Code section 226, Plaintiff and some of, but not  
9 necessarily all of, the Class are entitled to a penalty of seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750) from  
10 Defendants, injunctive relief in the form of compliance with section 226, and attorneys’ fees and  
11 costs.

12                                   **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13                   **(Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)**

14           95.     Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated here paragraphs  
15 1 through 94 in this Complaint.

16           96.     Defendants, and each of them, are “persons” as defined under California Business  
17 and Professions Code section 17201.

18           97.     Defendants’ conduct, as alleged, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful,  
19 and harmful to Plaintiff, other Class members, and to the public. Plaintiff seeks to enforce  
20 important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section  
21 1021.5.

22           98.     Defendants’ activities, as alleged, are violations of California law, and constitute  
23 unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code  
24 sections 17200, *et seq.*

25           99.     A violation of California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.* may  
26 be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All the acts described herein as violations  
27 of, among other things, the California Labor Code, are unlawful and in violation of public policy;  
28 and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive, fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby

1 constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in violation of California Business  
2 and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*

3 **Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages**

4 100. Defendants' failure to pay minimum and straight time wages, and other benefits in  
5 violation of the California Labor Code constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by  
6 California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*

7 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

8 101. Defendants' failure to pay overtime compensation and other benefits in violation of  
9 California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity  
10 prohibited by California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*

11 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

12 102. Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor  
13 Code sections 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful  
14 and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et*  
15 *seq.*

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

17 103. Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with  
18 California Labor Code section 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes  
19 unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code sections 17200,  
20 *et seq.*

21 **Failure to Indemnify Business Expenses**

22 104. Defendants' failure to reimburse expenses incurred in accordance with California  
23 Labor Code section 2802, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited  
24 by California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*

25 105. By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described  
26 above, Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from Plaintiff, and all  
27 persons similarly situated, and have deprived Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated, of  
28 valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

1           106. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees suffered monetary injury as a  
2 direct result of Defendants' wrongful conduct.

3           107. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, and on behalf  
4 of Aggrieved Employees are entitled to, and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge  
5 money and/or property which the Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiff, the  
6 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have been deprived, by means of the above-described unfair,  
7 unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees  
8 are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful practices of Defendants in  
9 order to recover restitution.

10           108. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, are further  
11 entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the above-described business practices are unfair,  
12 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of them,  
13 from engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices  
14 in the future.

15           109. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the Putative Class, have no  
16 plain, speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members  
17 suffered because of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a  
18 result of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiff,  
19 individually, and on behalf of members of the Putative Class, have suffered and will continue to  
20 suffer irreparable harm unless Defendants are restrained from continuing to engage in said unfair,  
21 unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

22           110. Plaintiff also alleges that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth  
23 above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other withholdings.

24           111. Pursuant to California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*,  
25 Plaintiff and Putative Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained  
26 by Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a  
27 permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and Class  
28

Members; an award of attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

**TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004,  
Cal. Lab. Code, §§ 2698, *et seq.*)**

112. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 111 in this Complaint.

113. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

114. California Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a) specifically provides for a private right of action to recover penalties for violations of the California Labor Code: "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 Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of the employee and other current or former employees against whom a violation of the same provision was committed pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3."

115. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.3. On or about October 29, 2024, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and former Aggrieved Employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiff also paid the filing fee on or about October 29, 2024. Plaintiff's PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-1058993-24. A true and correct copy of the PAGA notice is attached as **Exhibit 1**.

116. More than 65 days has elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice, but the Labor and Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants' Labor Code violations discussed in the notices. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil action to

1 recover penalties under California Labor Code section 2699 pursuant to section 2699.3 for the  
2 violations of the Labor Code described in this Complaint. Thus, pursuant to California Labor Code  
3 section 2699, subdivision (a), Plaintiff for himself and all current and former Aggrieved  
4 Employees, seeks recovery of any and all applicable civil penalties for Defendants' violation of  
5 California Labor Code sections 226, 226.3, 226.7, 558, 1197.1, 2699, 2800, and 2802.

6 117. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants' violation of California Labor  
7 Code section 1174, subdivision (d). Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174.5, any person,  
8 including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records  
9 required by California Labor Code section 1174 is subject to a penalty under section 1174.5.  
10 Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order section 7, subdivision (A)(3), every employer shall keep  
11 time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, and  
12 total hours worked daily shall also be recorded. Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order  
13 section 7, subdivision (A)(5), every employer shall keep total hours worked in the payroll period  
14 and applicable rates of pay.

15 118. During the time period of employment for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees,  
16 Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the California Labor Code and IWC Orders by  
17 failing to maintain accurate records showing meal periods, and accurate records showing when  
18 employees begin and end each work period. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records  
19 required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved  
20 Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal  
21 periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendants' records. Therefore, Plaintiff  
22 and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which  
23 resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the  
24 Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use  
25 and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in  
26 seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform their obligation under state law, all to their  
27 respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. Because of Defendants' knowing failure  
28 to comply with the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the

Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

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

120. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (g)(1) which states, "Any employee who prevails in any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

## **VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated only with respect to the Class claims, pray for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

### Class Certification

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

### As to the First Cause of Action

4. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 204 and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all minimum and straight time wages due;
5. For unpaid wages as may be appropriate;
6. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
7. For penalties, restitution, and liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1;
8. For liquidated damages;

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

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

As to the Second Cause of Action

11. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due;

12. For unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;

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

14. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, subdivision (a); and,

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

As to the Third Cause of Action

16. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

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

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

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

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

As to the Fourth Cause of Action

21. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

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

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

24. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

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

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

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

31. For all actual damages, according to proof;

32. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e);

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

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

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

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

36. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 2802 by willfully failing to indemnify employees for expenditures;

37. For unpaid wages or unreimbursed business expenses as may be appropriate;

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

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

39. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5 by willfully failing to produce employment records;

40. For statutory penalties under California Labor Code sections 226, subdivision (f) and 1198.5, subdivision (k);

41. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, under California Labor Code sections 226, subdivision (h) and 1198.5, subdivision (l);

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

43. For any other relief that the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

44. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to indemnify employees for expenditures;

45. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all Class Members and prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

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

47. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein under California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;

48. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, under California Business & Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*; and,

49. For any other relief that the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Tenth Cause of Action

50. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hour worked (including minimum, straight time, and

overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to indemnify employees for expenditures;

51. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699, *et seq.*, and all other applicable Labor Code provisions;

52. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; and

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

As to all Causes of Action

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

Dated: March 24, 2025

Respectfully submitted,



Thiago M. Coelho  
Lauren Lenzion  
Jesenia A. Martinez  
Jesse S. Chen  
**WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC**  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff and the  
Putative Class*

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

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

Dated: March 24, 2025

Respectfully submitted,



---

Thiago M. Coelho  
Lauren Lenzion  
Jesenia A. Martinez  
Jesse S. Chen  
**WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC**  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff and the  
Putative Class*

# EXHIBIT 1

**WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC**

3055 Wilshire Blvd, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90010  
Tel: (213) 381-9988  
Fax: (213) 381-9989  
wilshirelawfirm.com



Sean Paisan, Esq.  
Justin F. Marquez, Esq.  
John Yslas, Esq.

Stephanie Mazepa, Esq.  
Nicol Hajjar, Esq.  
Thiago Coelho, Esq.

October 29, 2024

LWDA  
Attn. PAGA Administrator  
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801  
Oakland, CA 94612  
***(Via Online Submission)***

Crimetek Security, Inc.  
P.O. Box 845  
Turlock, CA 95381  
***(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)***  
**#9489 0090 0027 6637 7098 24**

Edward Esmaili  
Agent for Service of Process for:  
Crimetek Security, Inc.  
P.O. Box 845  
Turlock, CA 95381  
***(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)***  
**#9489 0090 0027 6637 7098 17**

Crimetek Security, Inc.  
3448 N. Golden State Boulevard, Suite G  
Turlock, CA 95382  
***(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)***  
**#9489 0090 0027 6637 7098 00**

Edward Esmaili  
Agent for Service of Process for:  
Crimetek Security, Inc.  
3448 N. Golden State Boulevard, Suite G  
Turlock, CA 95382  
***(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)***  
**#9489 0090 0027 6637 7097 94**

Re: *Ed Senor v. Crimetek Security, Inc.*  
Notice of California Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Ed Senor to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") representative action (Cal. Lab. Code, §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against Mr. Senor's former employer, Crimetek Security, Inc. ("Crimetek"). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Crimetek engaged in with respect to Mr. Senor and all other persons who worked for Crimetek in California as a non-exempt or hourly-paid employee at any time within the applicable statutory period (the "Aggrieved Employees").

Mr. Senor wishes to pursue this action as an aggrieved employee, on behalf of the State of California, as well as on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees.

Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees suffered the California Labor Code violations described below.

### **Mr. Senor's Employment with Crimetek**

Crimetek owns or owned and operates or operated an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California. As such, and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Crimetek's business in California, Crimetek is subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC), and the California Business and Professions Code.

Mr. Senor worked for Crimetek in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from August 2016 to August 2024. During Mr. Senor's employment for Crimetek, Crimetek paid Mr. Senor an hourly wage and classified Mr. Senor as non-exempt from overtime.

Throughout Mr. Senor's employment, Crimetek: failed to pay for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages); failed to provide Mr. Senor with legally compliant meal periods (and pay corresponding meal period premium wages at the correct rate of pay); failed to authorize and permit Mr. Senor to take rest periods; failed to include all non-discretionary remuneration when calculating overtime pay, sick pay, and meal and rest period premium pay; failed to timely pay all final wages to Mr. Senor when Crimetek terminated Mr. Senor's employment; failed to furnish accurate wage statements to Mr. Senor; and failed to indemnify Mr. Senor for expenditures. As discussed below, Mr. Senor's experience working for Crimetek was typical and illustrative.

#### **Crimetek Failed to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Minimum, Straight Time, and Overtime Wages**

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

In addition, California Labor Code section 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday or 40 hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

California Labor Code sections 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, section 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the IWC is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Crimetek maintained a policy and practice of not paying Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Crimetek required Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees to work "off-the-clock", uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work during unpaid meal periods. Some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Crimetek also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

The failure to pay for all hours worked also includes a system of time rounding and/or synthetic

timekeeping that resulted in unpaid compensation for time worked pre-shift, post-shift, and when meal periods were supposedly recorded. If proven to be implemented by Crimetek, this system resulted, over a period of time, in failing to compensate Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees properly for all the time they have actually worked even though the realities of Crimetek's operations are such that it is possible, practical, and feasible to count and pay for work time to the minute. Accordingly, this system frequently paid Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees less than all their work time. Some of this unpaid work also should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, again Crimetek may have also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

As a result, Crimetek is liable to Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in California Labor Code sections 210, 1197.1, and 2699, subdivision (f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages.

### **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s).

Despite these legal requirements, Crimetek wrongfully failed to provide Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Crimetek regularly, but not always, required Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Instead, Crimetek continued to assert control over Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory meal periods, or by denying Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a meal period. Accordingly, Crimetek's policy and practice was not to provide meal periods to Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s). Crimetek, however, regularly failed to pay Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods and that were not provided.

As a result, Crimetek is liable to Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in California Labor Code sections 210 and 2699, subdivision (f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

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

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Throughout the statutory period, Crimetek has wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest periods. Crimetek regularly required Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Crimetek authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Instead, Crimetek continued to assert control over Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods, or by denying Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a rest period. Accordingly, Crimetek's policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Crimetek, however, regularly failed to pay Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Crimetek is liable to Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in California Labor Code sections 210 and 2699, subdivision (f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

### **Failure to Accurately Calculate Overtime Pay, Sick Pay, and Meal Period Premium Pay When Issuing Non-Discretionary Remuneration**

Federal law defining and interpreting "regular rate" under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) governs this case. (*Alonzo v. Maximus, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. 2011) 832 F.Supp.2d 1122, 1129.) This "construction is supported by California case law and the DLSE Manual, each of which looks to FLSA standards to interpret the 'regular rate of pay' under California law." (*Ibid.*) "Under the FLSA, the 'regular rate' of pay 'at which an employee is employed shall be deemed to include all remuneration for employment paid to, or on behalf of, the employee,' subject to certain enumerated exceptions." (*Id.* at pp. 1129–30, quoting 29 U.S.C. § 207, subd. (e)(3).) "The burden is on Defendant to establish that its bonus payments fall within one of the exceptions in § 207(e)." (*Ibid.*)

The Department of Labor has interpreted section 207 to permit an employer to exclude a "discretionary bonus," but not a "promised bonus" from the "regular rate" of pay:

Bonuses which are announced to employees to induce them to work more steadily or more rapidly or more efficiently or to remain with the firm are regarded as part of the regular rate of pay. Attendance bonuses, individual or group production bonuses, bonuses for quality and accuracy of work, bonuses contingent upon the employee's continuing in employment until the time the payment is to be made and the like are in this category. They must be included in the regular rate of pay.

(29 C.F.R. § 778.211 (2011); *see also* DLSE Manual § 49.1.2.4(3), incorporating 29 C.F.R. § 778.211.)

Mr. Senor and/or the Aggrieved Employees received various forms of bonuses/commissions/incentive payments during pay periods where overtime was worked, but Crimetek failed to *accurately* factor in the non-discretionary remuneration into their regular rate of pay.

As outlined by the California Supreme Court in *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858, 878, for purposes of paying sick pay and premiums, “the term ‘regular rate of compensation’ in section 226.7(c) has the same meaning as ‘regular rate of pay’ in section 510(a) and encompasses not only hourly wages but all nondiscretionary payments for work performed by the employee.”

Crimetek should have included all non-discretionary remuneration when calculating overtime pay, sick pay, and meal period premium pay. Because it did not, Crimetek is liable to Mr. Senor and/or the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in California Labor Code sections 210 and 2699, subdivision (f)(2).

### **Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods**

Mr. Senor seeks penalties under California Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d). Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by California Labor Code section 1174 is subject to a penalty under section 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order section 7, subdivision (A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Crimetek, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees.

Crimetek's failure to provide and maintain records required by the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Orders deprived Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Crimetek's records. Therefore, Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Crimetek. As a direct result, Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Crimetek to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts

according to proof at trial. As a result of Crimetek's knowing failure to comply with the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Mr. Senior and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

### **Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at 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 that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous 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.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Mr. Senior and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e., was terminated by quitting or being discharged, and the employment of others will be terminated. However, during the relevant time period, Crimetek failed, and continues to fail to pay Mr. Senior and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within 72 hours of their leaving Crimetek's employment. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), missed meal period premium wages, and missed rest period premium wages.

Crimetek's conduct violates California Labor Code sections 201 and 202. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days.

Accordingly, Mr. Senior and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Crimetek their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to California Labor Code section 203.

Moreover, Crimetek is liable to Mr. Senior and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in California Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

### **Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (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 the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security

number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Cal. Lab. Code, § 226, subd. (e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides: “An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.” (Cal. Lab. Code, § 226, subd. (e)(1).)

Throughout the statutory period, Crimetek failed to furnish Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law). Whether unpaid premiums for missed meal periods must be reported as “wages earned” and credited as “hours worked” in wage statements has been a settled issue since at least 2022.

Because Crimetek violated California Labor Code section 226, Mr. Senor and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights. Accordingly, Mr. Senor and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Crimetek the greater of their actual damages caused by Crimetek’s failure to comply with California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 per employee.

Moreover, Crimetek is liable to Mr. Senor and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in California Labor Code section 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

### **Failure to Indemnify for Necessary Expenditures**

California Labor Code section 2802, subdivision (a) provides that employers shall indemnify his or her employees for all necessary business expenditures or losses that have been incurred by the employees in direct discharge of his or her duties. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, Crimetek wrongfully required Mr. Senor and/or the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Crimetek. Mr. Senor and/or the Aggrieved Employees paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses (which is defined as including, without limitation, work attire, work equipment, personal protective equipment, use of personal cell phones, and/or use of personal vehicles). Mr. Senor and/or the Aggrieved Employees incurred substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Crimetek, but Crimetek failed to indemnify Mr. Senor and/or the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

As a result, Crimetek is liable to Mr. Senor and/or the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in California Labor Code sections 2802 and 2699, subdivision (f)(2) for failing to

indemnify Mr. Senor and/or the Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenditures.

**Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA**

In light of the above, Mr. Senor alleges that Crimetek violated the following provisions of the California Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

1. California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages;
2. California Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. California Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. California Labor Code sections 226.7, 246, 510, and applicable Wage Orders by failing to include all non-discretionary remuneration when calculating overtime pay, sick pay, and meal period premium pay;
5. California Labor Code section 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
6. California Labor Code sections 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
7. California Labor Code section 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
8. California Labor Code section 2802 by failing to indemnify for necessary expenditures.

Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Mr. Senor seeks applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under California Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699, subdivision (f)(2).

Mr. Senor has placed Crimetek on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence, as indicated on the first page. Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Patrick O'Connor, Esq.  
[patrick.oconnor@wilshirelawfirm.com](mailto:patrick.oconnor@wilshirelawfirm.com)

Wilshire Law Firm, PLC

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

Ed Senor v. Crimetek Security Inc., et al.  
Stanislaus County Superior Court Case No.: CV-24-008783

I, Virginia Tomlinson, state that I am employed in Los Angeles County, State of California; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12<sup>th</sup> Floor, Los Angeles, California 90010. My electronic service address is [virginia.tomlinson@wilshirelawfirm.com](mailto:virginia.tomlinson@wilshirelawfirm.com)

On **March 24, 2025**, I served the foregoing document(s) described as:

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

on interested parties in this action as follows:

Christina Cusimano, Esq.  
McCormick Barstow LLP  
7647 North Fresno Street  
Fresno, CA 93720

[Christina.Cusimano@mccormickbarstow.com](mailto:Christina.Cusimano@mccormickbarstow.com);  
[Jessica.Dominguez@mccormickbarstow.com](mailto:Jessica.Dominguez@mccormickbarstow.com);

*Attorneys for Defendant, CRIMETEK SECURITY INC.,*

(X) **BY E-MAIL:** Based on an agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission per Section 1010.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic notification addresses listed on the service list above, which is their most recent known email address or e-mail of record in this action. Pursuant to CCP 1013 (b)(1), my electronic service address is [virginia.tomlinson@wilshirelawfirm.com](mailto:virginia.tomlinson@wilshirelawfirm.com)

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

Executed on **March 24, 2025**, at Los Angeles, California.

  
Virginia Tomlinson