

1/24/2025 4:31:08 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By R. Chanez ,Deputy Clerk

1 Larry W. Lee (State Bar No. 228175)
2 Max W. Gavron (State Bar No. 291697)
3 **DIVERSITY LAW GROUP, P.C.**
4 515 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 1250
5 Los Angeles, CA 90071
6 (213) 488-6555
(213) 488-6554 facsimile
lwlee@diversitylaw.com
mgavron@diversitylaw.com

7 **POLARIS LAW GROUP**
8 William L. Marder, State Bar No. 170131
9 E-mail: bill@polarislawgroup.com
10 501 San Benito Street, Suite 200
Hollister, California 95023
Telephone: (831) 531-4214
Facsimile: (831) 634-0333

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees
12 (Additional Counsel on Next Page)

13 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
14 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

15 JEFF DOLLARHIDE, as a proxy for the State
16 of California on behalf of all similarly
17 aggrieved employees,

18 Plaintiff,

19 vs.

20 COATING SPECIALISTS AND
21 INSPECTION SERVICES, a California
22 corporation; RMA COMPANIES, an unknown
entity; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

23 Defendants.
24
25
26
27
28

Case No. 25CU004196C

**REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

**(1) VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §
2698 ET SEQ (PRIVATE
ATTORNEY GENERAL ACT)**

1 Dennis S. Hyun (State Bar No. 224240)
2 **HYUN LEGAL, APC**
3 515 S. Figueroa St., Suite 1250
4 Los Angeles, CA 90071
5 (213) 488-6555
6 (213) 488-6554 facsimile
7 dhyun@hyunlegal.com
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Plaintiff JEFF DOLLARHIDE (“Dollarhide” or “Plaintiff”) hereby submits this
2 Representative Action Complaint (“Complaint”) against Defendants COATING SPECIALISTS
3 AND INSPECTION SERVICES (“CSIS”), a California corporation, RMA COMPANIES
4 (“RMA”), an unknown entity, and DOES 1-50 (hereinafter collectively referred to as
5 “Defendants”), on behalf of the State of California for civil penalties for violations of the
6 California Labor Code, including without limitation, failure to pay all employees their earned
7 wages in a timely manner as follows:

8 **INTRODUCTION**

9 1. This representative action is within the Court’s jurisdiction under California
10 Labor Code section 2698 *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”).

11 2. This complaint challenges systemic illegal employment practices resulting in
12 violations of the California Labor Code against employees of Defendants.

13 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

14 1. The Court has jurisdiction over the violations of the PAGA. As alleged herein,
15 Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies pursuant to the PAGA.

16 2. Venue is proper because the Defendants do business in San Diego County, and
17 Plaintiff performed his work in San Diego County.

18 **PARTIES**

19 3. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants, as a third-party paint inspector, from in or
20 around 2011, until the present.

21 4. Plaintiff was and is the victim of the policies, practices, and customs of
22 Defendants complained of in this action in ways that have deprived him of the rights guaranteed
23 to him by California Labor Code section 204 and the PAGA.

24 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
25 herein mentioned Defendant CSIS was and is a corporation under the laws of the State of
26 California and doing business in the State of California. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and
27 based thereon alleges, that at all times herein mentioned Defendant RMA is an unknown entity
28 conducting business within the State of California.

1 6. As such and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants'
2 business, Defendants are subject to California Labor Code section 204.

3 7. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner
4 or corporate, of the defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, and for that reason,
5 said defendants are sued under such fictitious names. If and when they are ascertained, Plaintiff
6 prays for leave to amend this Complaint. Plaintiff is informed and believes and, based thereon
7 alleges, that each of said fictitious Defendants was responsible in some way for the matters
8 alleged herein and proximately caused Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to be subject to the
9 illegal employment practices, wrongs, and violations complained of herein.

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

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

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

25 11. At all times herein mentioned, the acts and omissions of various Defendants, and
26 each of them, concurred and contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and all of the
27 other Defendants in proximately causing the violations as herein alleged. At all times herein
28 mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, ratified each and every act or omission complained of

herein. At all times herein mentioned, the Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of each and all of the other Defendants in proximately causing the violations as herein alleged.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

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

**(BY PLAINTIFF AS PROXY FOR STATE OF CALIFORNIA ON BEHALF OF ALL
SIMILARLY AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

12. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

13. Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to timely pay wages to their employees. Defendants, as a matter of policy and practice, paid their employees on a bi-weekly basis and thus are subject to the timing requirements of Labor Code § 204(d).

14. Pursuant to Labor Code section 204(d), all earned wages by such employees must be paid out by the seventh (7th) day following the closing of the pay period. As a pattern and practice, Defendants had a consistent policy of paying the wages of its employees on the twelfth (12th) day or beyond following the close of the respective pay period, and thus, beyond the time periods as allowed pursuant to Labor Code section 204.

15. Plaintiff provided written notice to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) of Defendants’ violation of California Labor Code section 204 pursuant to PAGA on November 21, 2024. The LWDA has not provided written notice within 65 calendar days of Plaintiff’s written notice as to whether the LWDA intends to investigate Plaintiff’s said allegations. As such, Plaintiff has therefore complied with all notice and exhaustion requirements pursuant to PAGA.

16. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a), the Plaintiff seeks recovery of all applicable civil penalties, for himself and on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, for Defendants’ violation of Labor Code section 204.

//

//

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for himself and all others on whose behalf
3 this suit is brought against DEFENDANTS, jointly and severally, as follows:

4 1. Upon the First Cause of Action, for civil penalties according to proof pursuant to
5 Labor Code section 2698 *et seq.*;

6 2. On all causes of action, for attorney's fees and costs as provided by California
7 Labor Code section 2698 *et seq.* and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5; and

8 3. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.
9

10 DATED: January 24, 2025

DIVERSITY LAW GROUP, P.C.

11
12 By: 

Larry W. Lee

Max W. Gavron

Attorneys for Plaintiff
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28