

John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)  
[john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com](mailto:john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com)  
William M. Pao (SBN 219846)  
[william.pao@wilshirelawfirm.com](mailto:william.pao@wilshirelawfirm.com)  
**WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC**  
3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90010  
Telephone: (213) 381-9988  
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for *Plaintiffs*  
EMILIA JORDAN-LEMUS and  
YAIRA TORRES-VASQUEZ

**FILED**  
Superior Court of California  
County of Los Angeles  
05/05/2025  
David W. Stryker, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court  
By:                     A. He                     Deputy

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

EMILIA JORDAN-LEMUS and YAIRA  
TORRES-VASQUEZ, individually, on behalf of  
all others similarly situated, and on behalf of the  
State of California and other aggrieved persons,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DEVELOPMENTAL PATHWAYS INC., a  
California corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 24STCV21949

*Assigned for all purposes to:  
Hon. Stuart M. Rice, Dept. 1*

**SECOND AMENDED CLASS ACTION  
AND PAGA REPRESENTATIVE  
ACTION COMPLAINT:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1197.1);
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198);
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512);
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7);
5. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203);
6. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements (Cal. Lab. Code § 226);
7. Failure to Indemnify Employees for Expenditures (Cal. Lab. Code § 2802);
8. Failure to Produce Requested Employment Records (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226 and 1198.5);
9. Unfair Business Practices (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*); and
10. Civil Penalties Under PAGA (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*).

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Complaint filed: August 27, 2024

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

FAC filed:  
Trial date:

October 28, 2024  
Not set

1 Plaintiffs Emilia Jordan-Lemus and Yaira Torres-Vasquez (“Plaintiffs”), on information  
2 and belief, allege as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

4 1. Plaintiffs bring this action against Defendants Developmental Pathways Inc., and  
5 DOES 1 through 10 (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor  
6 Code violations and unfair business practices stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay for all  
7 hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failure to provide meal periods,  
8 failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to timely pay final wages, failure to furnish  
9 accurate wage statements, failure to indemnify employees for expenditures, and failure to produce  
10 requested employment records.

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

17 3. Plaintiffs bring the Tenth Cause of Action as a representative action under the Labor  
18 Code Private Attorneys Act of 2004, Labor Code sections 2698 *et seq.* (“PAGA”) to recover civil  
19 penalties that are owed to Plaintiffs, the State of California, and past and present non-exempt  
20 employees employed by Defendants in the State of California during the statute of limitations  
21 period for their PAGA claims (herein after referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”).

22 4. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and  
23 establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. As such and based  
24 upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants’ business in California, Defendants are  
25 subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission  
26 (“IWC”), and the California Business & Professions Code.

27 5. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period, Defendants have, at  
28 times:

---

- (a) Failed to pay some, but not necessarily all employees for all hours worked, including all minimum, straight time, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;
- (b) Failed to provide some, but not necessarily all employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failed to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and failed to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period violation occurred;
- (c) Failed to authorize and permit some, but not necessarily all employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, and failed to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a rest period violation occurred;
- (d) Willfully failed to pay some, but not necessarily all employees all minimum wage, straight time wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages due within the time period specified by California law when employment terminates;
- (e) Failed to provide some, but not necessarily all employees with accurate, itemized wage statements containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;
- (f) Failed to indemnify some, but not necessarily all employees for expenditures incurred in direct discharge of duties of employment; and
- (g) Failed to timely produce requested employment records to some, but not necessarily all employees as required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Order.

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

---

7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the unlawful conduct, policies, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing paragraphs as the employers of Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of “respondeat superior.”

## **THE PARTIES**

### **A. Plaintiffs**

8. Plaintiff Emilia Jordan-Lemus is a resident of Los Angeles, California who worked for Defendants in Los Angeles County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately April 2023 to approximately June 2024.

9. Plaintiff Yaira Torres-Vasquez is a resident of Los Angeles, California who worked for Defendants in Los Angeles County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee in approximately August 2024.

10. Plaintiffs reserve the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new Plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v. American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

### **B. Defendants**

11. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based upon that information and belief allege, that Defendant Developmental Pathways Inc. is, and at all times herein mentioned, was:

- (a) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including Los Angeles County; and,
- (b) The former employer of Plaintiffs, the current and/or former employer of the putative Class, and Aggrieved Employees because Defendant Developmental Pathways Inc. suffered and permitted Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees to work; and/or exercised control over their wages, hours, or working conditions; and/or engaged Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees, thereby creating a common law employment relationship.

12. Plaintiffs do not know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued herein as Does 2-10, inclusive, and therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiffs will amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

13. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 2-10, inclusive, and each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or injured Plaintiffs, a significant number of the Class, and Aggrieved Employees in the State of California.

14. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at all relevant times each Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiffs and the other employees described in the class definitions below, and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that each Defendant acted pursuant to 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.

#### **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

15. Plaintiff Emilia Jordan-Lemus worked for Defendants in Los Angeles County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately April 2023 to approximately June 2024. Plaintiff Yaira Torres-Vasquez worked for Defendants in Los Angeles County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee in approximately August 2024.

---

1           16.     During Plaintiffs’ employment for Defendants, Defendants paid Plaintiffs an hourly  
2 wage and classified Plaintiffs as non-exempt from overtime. Defendants repeatedly and frequently  
3 scheduled Plaintiffs to work at least five days in a workweek and at least eight hours per day, but  
4 Plaintiffs also worked more than eight hours in a workday and more than forty (40) hours in a  
5 workweek.

6           17.     Throughout Plaintiffs’ employment, Defendants, at times, failed to pay Plaintiffs  
7 for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failed to provide  
8 Plaintiffs with legally compliant meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs to take rest  
9 periods, failed to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiffs when Defendants terminated Plaintiffs’  
10 employment, failed to furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiffs, failed to indemnify Plaintiffs  
11 for expenditures, and failed to produce requested employment records.

12           18.     Throughout the statutory period, Defendants, at times, failed to pay Plaintiffs and  
13 some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked,  
14 including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Defendants would, at times, manufacture  
15 time keeping records to falsely show that Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the  
16 Class and Aggrieved Employees took meal periods when in fact they worked “off-the-clock,”  
17 uncompensated. The effect is that Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and  
18 Aggrieved Employees worked through meal periods “off-the-clock,” and continued to work after  
19 they had clocked out for the workday. Defendants paid Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily  
20 all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees less than all their work time. Some of this unpaid work  
21 should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Defendants also  
22 failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of,  
23 the Class and Aggrieved Employees worked.

24           19.     Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiffs  
25 and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant  
26 meal periods. Defendants required Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and  
27 Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-  
28 minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without

---

1 compensating Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees  
2 for all missed meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth  
3 hour of work. Instead, Defendants continued to assert control over Plaintiffs and some of, but not  
4 necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging  
5 them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking  
6 mandatory meal periods, or by denying Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class  
7 and Aggrieved Employees permission to take a meal period. Defendants also failed, at times, to  
8 permit Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees to  
9 take a second meal period when they worked at least ten hours of work in a workday. As described  
10 above, Defendants would manufacture time keeping records to falsely show that Plaintiffs and  
11 some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees took meal periods by the  
12 fifth hour of work or took meal periods when in fact they worked “off-the-clock”, uncompensated.  
13 Accordingly, Defendants failed to provide meal periods to Plaintiffs and some of, but not  
14 necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

15         20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have, at times, wrongfully failed to  
16 authorize and permit Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved  
17 Employees to take legally compliant rest periods. Defendants required Plaintiffs and some of, but  
18 not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive  
19 hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute,  
20 uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours),  
21 or without compensating Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved  
22 Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Instead, Defendants continued  
23 to assert control over Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved  
24 Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not  
25 be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods, or by denying Plaintiffs  
26 and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees permission to take a  
27 rest period. Accordingly, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs and some of, but not  
28 necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with

---

1 California law.

2 21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants, at times, willfully failed and refused  
3 to timely pay Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees  
4 all final wages due at their termination of employment. In addition, Plaintiffs's final paycheck did  
5 not include payment for all expenditures, minimum wage, straight time wages, overtime wages,  
6 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages owed to Plaintiffs by Defendants at  
7 the conclusion of Plaintiffs' employment. On information and belief, Defendants' failure to timely  
8 pay Plaintiffs' final wages when Plaintiffs' employment terminated was not a single, isolated  
9 incident, but was instead consistent with Defendants' practices that applied, at times, to Plaintiffs  
10 and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees.

11 22. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed, at times, to furnish Plaintiffs  
12 and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized  
13 wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including  
14 correct hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with  
15 California law, and correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take  
16 in accordance with California law). As a result of these violations of California Labor Code §  
17 226(a), the Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees  
18 suffered injury because, among other things:

- 19 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid  
20 minimum wage, straight time wages, overtime wages, meal period premium  
21 wages, and rest period premium wages, even though some, but not  
22 necessarily all, of them were entitled;
- 23 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum wage,  
24 straight time wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest  
25 period premium wages, even though some, but not necessarily all of them  
26 had not been;
- 27 (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum  
28 wage, straight time wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages,
-

and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though some, but not necessarily all of them 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 some, but not necessarily all of them 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 some, but not necessarily all of 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 some, but not necessarily all of 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 some, but not necessarily all of them, the violations caused some, but not necessarily all of 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 Plaintiffs and some, but not necessarily all of the Class and Aggrieved Employees were entitled, and Plaintiffs and some, but not necessarily all of the Class and Aggrieved Employees were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which some, but not necessarily all of them were entitled.

Thus, Plaintiffs and some, but not necessarily all of the Class and Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code § 226(e).

---

23. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully required Plaintiffs and some, but not necessarily all of the Class and Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants. Plaintiffs and some, but not necessarily all, of the Class paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses.

24. Plaintiffs and some of the Class and Aggrieved Employees incurred substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendants, but Defendants failed to indemnify Plaintiffs and some of the Class and Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

25. Plaintiff Emilia Jordan-Lemus sent written requests through Plaintiffs' counsel to Defendants for her personnel file, pay records, wage statements, timekeeping records, and other employment-related documents pursuant to Labor Code section 226 and 1198.5. However, Defendants failed to timely produce the requested employment records, in violation of Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5.

#### **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

26. Plaintiffs bring certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all other persons similarly situated, and thus, seek class certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

27. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiffs seek relief authorized by California law.

28. 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 employee 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.

29. At all material times, Plaintiffs were members of the Class.

30. Plaintiffs undertake this concerted activity to improve the wages and working conditions of all Class Members.

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

---

- 1 (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so  
2 numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical.  
3 The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiffs at this time;  
4 however, the Class is estimated to be greater than forty (40) individuals and  
5 the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of  
6 Defendants' records.
- 7 (b) Typicality: Plaintiffs is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect  
8 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-  
9 defined community of interest, and Plaintiffs' claims (or defenses, if any)  
10 are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.
- 11 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiffs is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect  
12 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-  
13 defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated  
14 herein. Plaintiffs has no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class  
15 Member. Plaintiffs' attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the  
16 rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement.  
17 Plaintiffs has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will  
18 continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be  
19 necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial  
20 benefit of each class member.
- 21 (d) Superiority: A Class Action is superior to other available methods for the  
22 fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:  
23 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling  
24 the prosecution or defense of separate actions;  
25 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy  
26 already commenced by or against members of the Class;  
27 3) The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the  
28 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.

32. 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 herein, 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 & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et. seq.* as a result of their illegal conduct as described above.

33. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 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) Plaintiffs, 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.
-

34. Plaintiffs contemplate the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The 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, Plaintiffs contemplate the use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as published notice, e-mail 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.

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

35. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 34 in this Complaint.

36. "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.

37. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants, at times, knowingly failed to pay to Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and 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 § 1194, and any additional applicable Wage Orders, which require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

38. Accordingly, Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover minimum and straight time wages for all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

39. By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees have been deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned by virtue of their employment with Defendants.

40. By virtue of the Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to

---

1 Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees for their non-  
2 overtime hours worked without pay, Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class  
3 and Aggrieved Employees suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are  
4 presently unknown to Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees, and which will be  
5 ascertained according to proof at trial.

6 41. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code §  
7 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage  
8 compensation due Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved  
9 Employees.

10 42. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194.2, Plaintiffs and some of, but not  
11 necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover liquidated damages  
12 (double damages) for Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages.

13 43. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all  
14 wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to  
15 this cause of action, Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees were entitled to be paid twice  
16 a month at rates required by law, including minimum and straight time wages. However,  
17 Defendants failed and refused to pay Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class  
18 and Aggrieved Employees all such wages due and failed to pay those wages twice a month.

19 44. Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to seek recovery of  
20 all unpaid minimum and straight time wages, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs  
21 pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6, and 1194(a).

## 22 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

### 23 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)**

24 45. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs  
25 1 through 34 in this Complaint.

26 46. California Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be  
27 employed more than eight hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they  
28 receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

---

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

6           48.     At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the  
7 Class and Aggrieved Employees have, at times, worked more than eight hours in a workday and/or  
8 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, as employees of Defendants.

9           49.     At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and some of, but not  
10 necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees overtime compensation for the hours they  
11 have worked in excess of the maximum hours permissible by law as required by California Labor  
12 Code §§ 510 and 1198.

13           50.     By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional premium rate  
14 compensation to the Plaintiffs and some of, but necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved  
15 Employees for their overtime hours worked, Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the  
16 Class and Aggrieved Employees have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts  
17 which are presently unknown to them, but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court  
18 and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

19           51.     By failing to keep adequate time records required by Labor Code § 1174(d),  
20 Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation due to  
21 Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees.

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

26           53.     California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all  
27 wages due and payable twice a month. The Wage Orders also provide that every employer shall  
28 pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime wages for all

---

overtime hours worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees with all compensation due, in violation of California Labor Code § 204.

### **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)**

54. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 34 in this Complaint.

55. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than at the end of Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees' fifth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal periods no later than at the end of the tenth hour of work in the workday. California Labor Code § 512, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an employer provide unpaid meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 for an employer to require any employee to work during any meal period mandated under any Wage Order.

56. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants, at times, failed to provide Plaintiffs and some, but not necessarily all of the Class and Aggrieved Employees with both meal periods as required by California law. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiffs and some, but not necessarily all of the Class and Aggrieved Employees to take all meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants, at times, made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable Wage Orders.

57. Under California law, Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s), plus interest thereon.

### **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods)**

58. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs

---

1 through 34 in this Complaint.

59. 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 § 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 4-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 is a violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest period mandated under any Wage Order.

60. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants at times failed to authorize Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and 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 Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of the Class and Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants, at times, made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable Wage Orders.

61. Under California law, Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and 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 thereon.

#### **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees – Waiting Time Penalties)**

62. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 34 in this Complaint.

63. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 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 seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless

---

1 the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in  
2 which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

3 64. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of many other members  
4 of the Class and Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e., was terminated by quitting or discharge, and  
5 the employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants, at times,  
6 failed, and continue to fail, to pay some of, but not necessarily all of, the terminated Class Members  
7 and Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by California Labor  
8 Code §§ 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their  
9 leaving Defendants' employ. Plaintiffs does not allege that all of the Class Members were so  
10 harmed.

11 65. Defendants' failure to pay some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class members  
12 and Aggrieved Employees who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages earned and  
13 unpaid at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants'  
14 employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

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

19 67. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 203, some of the Class and Aggrieved  
20 Employees are entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally accruing wages for each day  
21 they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to thirty (30) days maximum.

22 68. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, the Class and  
23 Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest,  
24 expenses, and costs incurred in this action.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

---

**SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and  
Compliant Wage Records)**

69. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 34 in this Complaint.

70. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(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.

71. 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 Plaintiffs and some of the Class and Aggrieved Employees, the failure to list the true “total hours worked by the employee,” and the failure to list the true net wages earned. Plaintiffs do not allege that all of the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees were so harmed.

72. As a result of Defendants’ violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

73. Specifically, Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees have been injured by Defendants’ intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved

---

1 Employees were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving,  
2 accurate, itemized wage statements under California Labor Code § 226(a).

3 74. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiffs and some of, but not  
4 necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees is difficult and time consuming. As a result  
5 of this unlawful burden, Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved  
6 Employees were also injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt to obtain correct  
7 wage information following Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the mandates of  
8 California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

9 75. Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved  
10 Employees are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by  
11 Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not  
12 exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000) per employee.

13 76. Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to injunctive relief,  
14 as well as an award of attorney's fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant  
15 to California Labor Code § 226(h).

16 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Indemnify Employees for Expenditures)**

18 77. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs  
19 1 through 34 in this Complaint.

20 78. As set forth above, Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and  
21 Aggrieved Employees were required to incur substantial necessary expenditures and losses in  
22 direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of Defendants.

23 79. Defendants violated California Labor Code § 2802, by failing to pay and indemnify  
24 Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees for necessary  
25 expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their  
26 obedience to directions of Defendants.

27 80. As a result, Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and  
28 Aggrieved Employees were damaged at least in the amounts of the expenses they paid, or which

---

1 were deducted by Defendants from their wages.

2 81. Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to reasonable attorney's  
3 fees, expenses, and costs of suit pursuant to California Labor Code § 2802(c) and interest pursuant  
4 to California Labor Code § 2802(b).

5 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Produce Requested Employment Records)**

7 82. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs  
8 1 through 34 in this Complaint.

9 83. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226, current and former employees have the  
10 right to inspect or receive a copy of their records pertaining to their employment, upon reasonable  
11 request to their employer. Under this statute, an employer that receives a request to inspect or  
12 receive a copy of records pertaining to a current or former employee must comply with the request  
13 as soon as practicable, but no later than twenty-one (21) calendar days from the date of the request.

14 84. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1198.5(a), every current and former employee,  
15 or his or her representative, has the right to inspect and receive a copy of the personnel records that  
16 the employer maintains relating to the employee's performance or to any grievance concerning the  
17 employee. Under this statute, upon written request from a current or former employee or his or her  
18 representative, an employer must make the contents of those personnel records available for  
19 inspection or provide a copy of the personnel records to the current or former employee, or his or  
20 her representative, not later than thirty (30) calendar days from the date the employer receives the  
21 written request, subject to some limited exceptions. Failure to comply with these requests allows  
22 for a civil penalty seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750), pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1198.5(k) and  
23 226(f).

24 85. As set forth above, Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees are current and  
25 former employees of Defendants.

26 86. Plaintiff Emilia Jordan-Lemus sent a written request through Plaintiffs' counsel to  
27 Defendants for Plaintiffs' personnel file, pay records, wage statements, timekeeping records, and  
28

---

1 other employment-related documents pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5. However,  
2 Defendants failed to timely produce the requested employment records.

3 87. Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 226, and 1198.5 by failing to timely  
4 produce the required records requested by Plaintiffs.

5 88. On information and belief, Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiffs with Plaintiffs'  
6 requested employment records is not an isolated incident but was instead consistent with  
7 Defendants' practice that applied to Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily all of, the Class and  
8 Aggrieved Employees.

9 89. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1198.5, Plaintiffs and some of, but not  
10 necessarily all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to a penalty of seven hundred  
11 fifty dollars (\$750) from Defendants, injunctive relief in the form of compliance with section  
12 1198.5, and attorneys' fees and costs.

13 90. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226, Plaintiffs and some of, but not necessarily  
14 all of, the Class and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to a penalty of seven hundred fifty dollars  
15 (\$750) from Defendants, injunctive relief in the form of compliance with section 226, and  
16 attorneys' fees and costs.

17 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **(Against All Defendants for Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200,**  
19 **et seq.)**

20 91. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs  
21 1 through 34 in this Complaint.

22 92. Defendants, and each of them, are "persons" as defined under California Business  
23 & Professions Code § 17201.

24 93. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,  
25 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiffs, other Class members, and Aggrieved Employees, and to the  
26 general public. Plaintiffs seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the  
27 meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

28 94. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and

---

1 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions  
2 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

3 95. A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be  
4 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as violations  
5 of, among other things, the California Labor Code, are unlawful and in violation of public policy;  
6 and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive, fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby  
7 constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in violation of California Business  
8 & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

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

10 96. Defendants' failure to pay minimum and straight time wages, and other benefits in  
11 violation of the California Labor Code constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by  
12 California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

13 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

14 97. Defendants' failure to pay overtime compensation and other benefits in violation of  
15 California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity  
16 prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

17 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

18 98. Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor  
19 Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or  
20 unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

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

22 99. Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with  
23 California Labor Code § 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful  
24 and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

25 **Failure to Indemnify Business Expenses**

26 100. Defendants' failure to reimburse expenses incurred in accordance with California  
27 Labor Code § 2802, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by  
28 California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

---

1           101. By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described  
2 herein, Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from Plaintiffs, and all  
3 persons similarly situated, and Aggrieved Employees and have deprived Plaintiffs, and all persons  
4 similarly situated, and Aggrieved Employees of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all  
5 to their detriment.

6           102. Plaintiffs, the Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees suffered monetary injury  
7 as a direct result of Defendants' wrongful conduct.

8           103. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, the State of  
9 California, and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to, and do, seek such relief as may be  
10 necessary to disgorge money and/or property which the Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or  
11 of which Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees have been deprived, by means of the  
12 above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiffs, the Class, and  
13 Aggrieved Employees are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful  
14 practices of Defendants in order to recover restitution.

15           104. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, the State of  
16 California, and other Aggrieved Employees are further entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that  
17 the above-described business practices are unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief  
18 restraining the Defendants, and each of them, from engaging in any of the above-described unfair,  
19 unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in the future.

20           105. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, the State of  
21 California, and other Aggrieved Employees have no plain, speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law  
22 to redress the injuries which the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees suffered as a  
23 consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a result  
24 of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiffs,  
25 individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, the State of California, and other  
26 Aggrieved Employees have suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless the  
27 Defendants are restrained from continuing to engage in said unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent  
28 business practices.

---

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

107. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiffs, putative Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiffs, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

#### **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

108. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 34 in this Complaint.

109. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the State of California and the applicable IWC Orders.

110. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action to recover penalties for violations of the 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 herself or himself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3."

111. Plaintiffs gave written notice by online filing pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiffs and certain current and former Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, including the facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiffs also paid the filing fee. Plaintiffs' PAGA case number is

---

1 LWDA-CM-1060383-24 (*Emilia Jordan-Lemus, et al. v. Developmental Pathways Inc., et al.*).  
2 The Labor and Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate  
3 Defendants' Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Plaintiffs hereby commence a civil  
4 action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the  
5 Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties  
6 under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699.

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

12 113. In addition, Plaintiffs seek an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant  
13 to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in any action shall be  
14 entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

### 15 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

16 Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated only with respect to  
17 the class claims, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

#### 18 **Class Certification**

19 1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second, Third,  
20 Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Causes of Action;

21 2. That Plaintiffs be appointed as the representatives of the Class; and,

22 3. That counsel for Plaintiffs be appointed as Class Counsel.

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

24 4. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California  
25 Labor Code §§ 204 and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all  
26 minimum and straight time wages due;

27 5. For unpaid wages as may be appropriate;

28 6. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date

---

1 such amounts were due;

2 7. For penalties, restitution, and liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code  
3 § 1197.1;

4 8. For liquidated damages;

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

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

8 As to the Second Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

18 As to the Third Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

27 ///

28 ///

---

As to the Fourth Cause of Action

21. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 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 § 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. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment;

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

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

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

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

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

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

32. For all actual damages, according to proof;

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

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

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

---

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

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

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

43. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 226(f) and 1198.5(k);

44. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h) and 1198.5(l);

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

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

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

47. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, and failing to authorize and permit rest periods;

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

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

---

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

51. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and,

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

As to the Tenth Cause of Action

53. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, failing to pay all earned wages twice per month, failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failing to timely pay final wages, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, failing to indemnify for expenditures, and failing to produce requested employment records;

54. An award of civil penalties on behalf of Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of the State of California, and all similarly aggrieved employees pursuant to PAGA;

55. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate allowed;

56. Attorneys' fees and costs reasonably incurred; and

57. Injunctive and declaratory relief to the extent allowed by PAGA.

As to all Causes of Action

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

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 25, 2025

**WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC**

By: 

JOHN G. YSLAS  
WILLIAM M. PAO  
Attorneys for *Plaintiffs*  
EMILIA JORDAN-LEMUS and  
YAIRA TORRES-VASQUEZ

///

///

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury.

Dated: April 25, 2025

**WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC**

By:   
JOHN G. YSLAS  
WILLIAM M. PAO  
Attorneys for *Plaintiffs*  
EMILIA JORDAN-LEMUS and  
YAIRA TORRES-VASQUEZ