

Case Management Conference
2027-02-01 8:45AM in 11A

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

Jason W. Rothman (Cal. Bar No. 304961)

jason@tomorrowlaw.com

1460 Westwood Boulevard

Los Angeles, California 90024

Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

Attorneys for Plaintiff EMILY HENG,
as an Aggrieved Employee, and on behalf of all other
Aggrieved Employees

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN

EMILY HENG, as an Aggrieved Employee,
and on behalf of all other Aggrieved
Employees under the Labor Code Private
Attorneys' General Act of 2004,

Plaintiff

v.

WORLD MARKET, LLC, California limited
liability company; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: STK-CV-UOE-2026-0011731

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

**COMPLAINT UNDER THE LABOR
CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS'
GENERAL ACT OF 2004 FOR CIVIL
PENALTIES UNDER LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1
and 2699**

[Amount in Controversy Greater Than
\$35,000.00]

1 Plaintiff Emily Heng (“Plaintiff”), as an Aggrieved Employee, and on behalf of all other
2 Aggrieved Employees under the Labor Code Private Attorneys’ General Act of 2004, alleges as
3 follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 1. This is a representative action, pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General
6 Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”), against World Market, LLC,
7 a California limited liability company, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies
8 within the State of California (“World Market”), (hereinafter, collectively, with DOES 1 through
9 100, as further defined below, “Defendants”) as a proxy of the Labor and Workforce Development
10 Agency of the State of California (“LWDA”), on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees
11 that worked for Defendants during the PAGA Period. Specifically, in connection with any alleged
12 claims for failure to comply with Labor Code sections 200, 202, 203, 204, 210, 223, 226, 226.3,
13 245, 246, 1198, and applicable Wage Orders, Plaintiff seeks to represent all current and former
14 employees that worked for Defendants during the PAGA Period. On all other claims mentioned
15 herein, Plaintiff seeks to represent only non-exempt current and former employees that worked for
16 Defendants during the PAGA Period. Collectively, these employees are herein referred to as
17 “Aggrieved Employees.” The “PAGA Period” refers to one year preceding the date notice was
18 submitted to the LWDA, continuing past the date of notice to the LWDA until judgement is entered.

19 **PARTIES**

20 2. Plaintiff EMILY HENG is a resident of the State of California. At all relevant times
21 herein, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants employed
22 Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee. Plaintiff worked as a customer attendant with duties that
23 included, but were not limited to, assisting customers. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based
24 thereon alleges, that Plaintiff EMILY HENG worked for Defendants from approximately August of
25 2024 through the present.

26 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant World
27 Market is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing
28 under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of San

1 Joaquin, State of California. At all relevant times herein, World Market employed Plaintiff and
2 Aggrieved Employees within the State of California.

3 4. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise,
4 of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff,
5 who therefore sues defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474.
6 Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the defendants designated
7 herein as DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein.
8 Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of
9 the defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known.

10 **JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS**

11 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each defendant
12 acted in all respects pertinent to this action, as the agent of the other defendant(s), carried out a joint
13 scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are
14 legally attributable to the other defendants. Whenever, heretofore or hereinafter, reference is made
15 to "Defendants," it shall include World Market, and any of their parent, subsidiary, or affiliated
16 companies within the State of California, as well as DOES 1 through 100 identified herein.

17 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that all the times
18 mentioned herein, each of the Defendants was the agent, principal, employee, employer,
19 representative, joint venture or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, either actually or
20 ostensibly, and in doing the things alleged herein acted within the course and scope of such agency,
21 employment, joint venture, and conspiracy.

22 7. All of the acts and conduct described herein of each and every corporate defendant
23 was duly authorized, ordered, and directed by the respective and collective defendant corporate
24 employers, and the officers and management-level employees of said corporate employers. In
25 addition thereto, said corporate employers participated in the aforementioned acts and conduct of
26 their said employees, agents, and representatives, and each of them; and upon completion of the
27 aforesaid acts and conduct of said corporate employees, agents, and representatives, the defendant
28 corporation respectively and collectively ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded,

1 acquiesced, authorized, and otherwise approved of each and all of the said acts and conduct of the
2 aforementioned corporate employees, agents and representatives.

3 8. As a result of the aforementioned facts, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based
4 thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are joint employers.

5 **JURISDICTION**

6 9. Jurisdiction exists in the Superior Court of the State of California pursuant to Code
7 of Civil Procedure section 410.10.

8 10. Venue is proper in San Joaquin County, California pursuant to Code of Civil
9 Procedure sections 392, *et seq.* because, among other things, San Joaquin County is where the causes
10 of action complained of herein arose; the county in which the employment relationship began; the
11 county in which performance of the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff and
12 Defendants was due to be performed; the county in which the employment contract, or part of it,
13 between Plaintiff and Defendants was actually performed; and the county in which Defendants, or
14 some of them, reside. Moreover, the unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff
15 and Aggrieved Employees in San Joaquin County, and Defendants employ Aggrieved Employees
16 in San Joaquin County.

17 **PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ALLEGATIONS**

18 11. Plaintiff is an “Aggrieved Employee” under PAGA, as Plaintiff was employed by
19 Defendants during the PAGA Period and suffered the Labor Code violations set forth herein.
20 Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties under PAGA, plus reasonable attorneys’ fees
21 and costs, for Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved Employees of Defendants during the PAGA Period.

22 12. Specifically, Plaintiff seeks to recover PAGA civil penalties through a representative
23 action permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in, among other authorities, *Arias v.*
24 *Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969. According to the same authorities, class certification of the
25 PAGA allegations described herein is not required.

26 13. Labor Code section 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g), authorizes Aggrieved Employees
27 such as Plaintiff to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures specified
28 in Labor Code section 2699.3 on behalf of Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved Employees within the

1 PAGA Period.

2 14. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, on or around April 29, 2026, Plaintiff
3 provided written notice of Defendants' violation of various provisions of the Labor Code to the
4 LWDA online and by certified mail, with return receipt requested, to Defendants ("PAGA Notice").

5 15. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a)(2)(A), the LWDA did not
6 provide notice of its intention to investigate Defendants' alleged violations within sixty-five (65)
7 calendar days of the PAGA Notice.

8 16. To the extent Defendants, or either of them, previously used the notice and cure
9 provision of Labor Code section 2699.3 within the last twelve months, under section 2699.3(d), then
10 Defendants, or those who have availed themselves of the cure provisions validly, are not eligible to
11 cure the violations discussed herein under section 2699.3 or otherwise use the early evaluation
12 conference process pursuant to section 2699.3(f).

13 17. In the event that Defendants, or either of them, is/are determined to have satisfied
14 sections 2699(g), 2699(h), or otherwise 2699(d)(1), Defendants, or any that is determined to have
15 satisfied sections 2699(g), 2699(h), is also, in the alternative, liable for civil penalties pursuant to
16 Labor Code sections 2699(j), 2699(e)(2), and 2699(f)(2).

17 18. In the event that Defendants, or either of them, is/are determined to have, prior to
18 this notice or a request for records pursuant to Labor Code section 226, 432, or 1198.5, from Plaintiff
19 and/or Plaintiff's counsel, adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all
20 provisions identified in this notice, said defendant(s) is/are still liable for civil penalties pursuant to
21 section 2699(g)(1)-(3).

22 19. In the event that Defendants, or either of them is/are deemed to have adequately taken
23 all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice within sixty (60)
24 days of receiving this notice, said defendant(s) is/are still liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor
25 Code section 2699(h)(1)-(3).

26 20. In the event, the LWDA and/or a court issued a finding or determination to the
27 Defendants, or either of them, that within five (5) years preceding the date of the PAGA Notice the
28 policies or practices which gave rise to the violations alleged herein were unlawful, Defendants, or

1 any of them, would be subject to heightened penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections
2 2699(f)(2)(B)(i), 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3) and **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either
3 Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h) for remedying violations either prior to or after the serving
4 of the PAGA Notice. Regardless, Plaintiff alleges Defendants' conduct giving rise to the violations
5 as detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, particularly given, among
6 other reasons, Defendants have been sued for these violations in the past. Thus, Defendants, or any
7 of them, are further subject to increased penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii) and
8 lack eligibility for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h).

9 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

10 21. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew,
11 or should have known, that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to receive wages for all
12 time worked, including regular, overtime, and double times wages, and that Plaintiff and Aggrieved
13 Employees were not receiving all wages owed for work that was required to be performed.

14 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had
15 and have a policy or practice of requiring Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to work more
16 than eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a
17 workweek (in violation of Labor Code sections 551 and 552) without paying them proper overtime
18 wages.

19 23. Upon information and belief, Defendants failed to accurately track and/or pay for all
20 minutes actually worked by Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees at the proper rates of pay.
21 Defendants also engaged, suffered, or permitted Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock,
22 including, without limitation, by requiring Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to clock out for meal
23 periods and continue working.

24 24. In addition, Defendants failed to include all forms of remuneration, including non-
25 discretionary bonuses, and other forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay during pay
26 periods where overtime was worked.

27 ///

28 ///

1 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
2 violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 223, 510, 551, 552, 1197, 1182.12, and applicable
3 Wage Orders based on its continued failure to pay minimum and overtime wages for all hours
4 worked. Thus, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to actual and liquidated
5 damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2, and 1198. Plaintiff is further
6 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such
7 violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendants would also be liable for civil
8 penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1197.1,
9 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Defendants would further
10 be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

11 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants, and
12 each of them, had and have a policy or practice of compelling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
13 Employees during the PAGA Period to work every day in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per
14 day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or
15 compensation in lieu thereof. By way of example, Defendants regularly denied Plaintiff and
16 Aggrieved Employees lawful meal periods by, without limitation, interrupting meal periods; failing
17 to provide meal periods all together; providing short meal periods, including without limitation,
18 meal periods that may appear on the record to be 30 minutes or longer but in practice were shorter
19 than thirty minutes due to walking time to get to a designated break area; and requiring on-duty/on-
20 call meal periods. For example, Plaintiff was often required to work through meal periods in order
21 to meet Defendants' quota requirements and workload demands.. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
22 Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes,
23 and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated Labor Code sections 512 and 1198 each day for
24 each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed
25 one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period
26 under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Plaintiff is informed and believes that those premium
27 payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made for these non-compliant meal periods,
28 either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties

1 pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for
2 both failing to authorize the taking of compliant meal periods and for failing to provide premium
3 pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k).
4 Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct that
5 gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such, Defendants are
6 further liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

7 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
8 maintain policies or practices of compelling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees every day to,
9 including, without limitation, work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without
10 authorizing and permitting Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted, timely,
11 and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the employees are completely relieved of all of their
12 duties. By way of example, Defendants regularly denied Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees lawful
13 rest periods by, without limitation, interrupting rest periods; by failing to provide rest periods all
14 together; failing to provide rest periods that were at least ten minutes in length, including rest periods
15 that may have encompassed a total of ten minutes but were in practice less than ten uninterrupted
16 minutes due to, without limitation, walking time to get to a designated break area; not providing rest
17 periods in a timely fashion; and otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call rest periods. Plaintiff and other
18 Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and
19 believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day
20 for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee
21 was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the
22 PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Plaintiff is informed and believes that
23 those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-
24 compliant rest periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code
25 sections 226.7 and 1198. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code
26 sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize
27 the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code
28 section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further

1 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such
2 violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such, Defendants are further liable for
3 civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

4 28. As a result of, among other things, Defendants' herein-described policy or practice
5 of failing to: accurately record time; failing to pay overtime and minimum wages; failing to provide
6 meal periods; failing to provide rest periods; and failing to provide compensation in lieu of meal or
7 rest periods, as described above, and due to independent failures in connection therewith, Plaintiff
8 is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants also intentionally failed and
9 continues to fail to furnish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements that
10 accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; the
11 inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; the name of the employee and only the
12 last four digits of their social security number or an employee identification number other than a
13 social security number; all deductions; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
14 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee; the legal name and
15 address of the employer, and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226,
16 subdivision (a). Specifically, Defendants intentionally failed to furnish employees with itemized
17 wage statements that accurately reflect the hours worked by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
18 Employees and the rates of pay at which they were or should have been paid (including due to failure
19 to pay at the proper regular rate), thus resulting in a failure to reflect gross and net wages earned and
20 paid at each rate, as well. Consequently, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon
21 alleges, that Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226, and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved
22 Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Plaintiff and each Aggrieved Employee
23 personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 226 for each
24 pay period worked during the PAGA Period. Plaintiff is informed and believes that those penalties
25 under Labor Code section 226 were not paid for these violations of Labor Code section 226.
26 Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558,
27 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further
28 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such

1 violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Thus, Defendants would further be liable
2 for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

3 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants also
4 failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without
5 limitation, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for purchasing
6 uniforms, for the purchase of tools and safety equipment, and for the use of cellular phones, in direct
7 consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of Defendants,
8 as required by Labor Code sections 1198, 2800, 2802, and other statutory and common law
9 offenses. As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these
10 violations and Defendants are liable to reimburse Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for these
11 costs incurred in furtherance of work duties. Defendants would thus be liable for civil penalties
12 pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1)
13 and 2699(k). Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants'
14 conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. As such,
15 Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
16 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

17 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants had and
18 have a policy or practice of failing to pay Aggrieved Employees their wages in accordance with
19 Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days,
20 inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during
21 which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of
22 any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Plaintiff
23 is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants did not and do not pay Plaintiff
24 and other Aggrieved Employees all wages owed every day and every workweek in accordance with
25 Labor Code sections 204 and 1198. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges,
26 that Defendants violated Labor Code section 204 and that Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees
27 have personally suffered these violations. As such, Defendants would be liable for civil penalties
28 pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections

1 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Plaintiff further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
2 Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or
3 oppressive. Therefore, Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code
4 section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

5 31. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
6 have or had a policy or practice of failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with
7 all rights afforded to them under the Healthy Workplace Healthy Families Act of 2014, codified at
8 Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*, including, without limitation, the amount of paid sick leave required
9 to be provided pursuant to California and local laws. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that
10 the sick pay was not provided at the proper regular of pay as required under California law due to
11 failure to properly calculate the regular rate. Plaintiff is additionally informed and believes that the
12 notice requirement of Labor Code section 221, 223, 233, 234, 245 and 246 involves a mandatory
13 payroll or workplace injury reporting. Plaintiff is thus informed and believes that Defendants
14 violated these Labor Code sections, as well as Labor Code section 1198. As such, Plaintiff and
15 other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations under these sections and
16 Defendants would be liable for civil penalties for violation of the paid sick leave regulations under
17 Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, as well as equitable, injunctive, or restitutionary relief, and
18 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. Plaintiff further informed and believes, and based thereon
19 alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent,
20 or oppressive. Defendants would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section
21 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

22 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, as follows: Defendants
23 knew or should have known it imposed systematic quota and production demands on Plaintiff and
24 other Aggrieved Employees which violated the rights of Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees under
25 Labor Code sections 2100, *et seq.* Specifically, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon
26 alleges, that Defendants had a duty to ensure its production demands/quotas did not prevent Plaintiff
27 and Aggrieved Employees from complying with laws pertaining to meal periods, rest periods,
28 bathroom breaks (including, without limitation, reasonable travel time to and from bathroom

1 facilities), and/or exposing them to safety or Occupational Safety and Health Administration
2 (“OSHA”) hazards. Defendants, or some of them, constitute a “covered employer” and its
3 warehouse employees are “covered employees.” Defendants, or some of them, implement quotas
4 as defined in Labor Code section 2100, subdivision (h) and subjects Plaintiff and Aggrieved
5 Employees to adverse employment actions as defined in Labor Code section 2102. Furthermore,
6 Defendants, or some of them, willfully, knowingly and intentionally established quotas that harmed
7 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees all to increase Defendants’ profits without concern for employee
8 safety. Defendants, in fact, tracked meals, rest, and recovery periods, that were not provided and
9 did nothing to change its policies and practices. Defendants also restricted and monitored the use
10 of bathroom facilities and charged the time Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees used the bathroom
11 against their quota. In other words, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees who did not wait to use the
12 restroom during meal or rest periods or before or after their shift, were penalized for not meeting
13 the quota either through reprimands, warnings, and termination. Defendants maintained a point
14 system designed to prevent Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees from complying with California law
15 as alleged in this Notice and systematically used to punish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees.
16 Furthermore, Defendants prevented compliance with California’s meal and rest break laws and
17 failed to consider meal and rest breaks as productive time when Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees
18 were required to remain on call in violation of Labor Code section 2103, subdivision (b). Plaintiff
19 and Aggrieved Employees were not permitted to take compliant meal breaks, rest breaks, and/or
20 rest and recovery periods when requested, due to Defendants’ unlawful policy and practice to favor
21 production goals over the rights of Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees. Consequently, Plaintiff and
22 other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with meal periods (or second meal periods); and/or
23 authorized or permitted to take rest periods (including second or third rest periods); and/or recovery
24 periods; and Defendants’ policies prevented Aggrieved Employees from taking these meal, rest
25 and/or recovery periods as required by California law. Furthermore, Defendants did not provide to
26 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees a written description of each quota that was applicable to
27 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees; maintained secret (undisclosed) quotas; and failed to provide
28 written disclosures each and every time quotas changed either seasonally, daily, hourly, weekly

1 and/or monthly. This includes the number of tasks to be performed or materials that must be
2 produced or handled within a time period, and any potential adverse employment action that could
3 result from failing to meet the quota. This information has not been given by Defendants to Plaintiff
4 and Aggrieved Employees, including when hired, commencing on January 1, 2022 to the present.
5 Additionally, Defendants changed the “quota” regularly without notice, as often as per pay period.
6 Defendants were also required to provide a new written quota disclosure each and every time the
7 quota changed and failed to do so since the Notice was provided. Defendants failed to produce
8 Plaintiff’s written quota disclosure upon written request pursuant to Labor Code sections 2100
9 through 2112, and failed to provide written disclosures to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees,
10 including new hires, since January 1, 2022, as well as to current employees each time the quota
11 changed. Defendants had and has a policy and practice of taking adverse employment action against
12 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for failing to meet a quota that does not allow Plaintiff and
13 Aggrieved Employees to comply with meal and rest periods, or occupational health and safety laws
14 in the Labor Code or Division Standards, or for failure to meet a quota that has not been disclosed
15 to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees pursuant to Labor Code section 2101. Plaintiff thus violated
16 Labor Code sections 2100 through 2112. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered
17 these violations, which in turn would entitle Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties
18 prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Defendants would also be liable for civil
19 penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5, 1695.55, 1198 and 2699. Plaintiff further
20 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants’ conduct above gave rise to such
21 violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive, particularly given, among other reasons,
22 Defendants have been sued for these violations in the past. Thus, Defendants would further be liable
23 for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

24 33. In addition to the above, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges
25 that Defendants failed and continue to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage
26 statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to
27 obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code
28 section 1198.5, time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Plaintiff and

1 other Aggrieved Employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Plaintiff and
2 the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, which in turn would entitle Plaintiff
3 and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5.
4 Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5,
5 and 2699. Plaintiff further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants'
6 conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Defendants
7 would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

8 34. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants
9 failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to comply with the notice requirements of Labor
10 Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing
11 to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay
12 applicable to their employment; any allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage; the regular
13 payday designated by Defendants; the name of the employer, including any "doing business as"
14 names used by the employer; the physical address of the employer's main office and the telephone
15 number of the employer; the name, address and telephone number of the workers' compensation
16 insurance carrier; information regarding paid sick leave; and other pertinent information required to
17 be disclosed by Defendants under Labor Code section 2810.5. Plaintiff is informed and believes that
18 Defendants' failure to provide such information, including rates of pay that are in effect, has
19 permitted Defendants to pay employees at rates of pay that were not agreed upon and violate
20 minimum wage and overtime wage laws in California. Plaintiff is informed and believes that
21 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1198 and 2810.5. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
22 Employees personally suffered these violations. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based
23 thereon alleges, that Defendants' conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious,
24 fraudulent, or oppressive. Among other relief, employees may collect from Defendants in
25 connection with these violations' civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and
26 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Defendants would further be liable
27 for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

35. Plaintiff, in Plaintiff's representative capacity, seeks civil penalties under Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699 for the herein-described acts, which violate the California Labor Code as described above, including on behalf of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees pursuant to PAGA.

FIRST AND ONLY CAUSE OF ACTION

(Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys' General Act (2004) – Against All Defendants)

36. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 210

37. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 204, requires and required that:

“[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month.”

38. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a) states and stated that “[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3, 204, 204b, 204.1, 205, 205.5, and 1197.5, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee” and “(2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.”

39. At all relevant times herein, Defendants have had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees during their employment on a timely basis as per Labor Code section 204 including, without limitation, for the reasons and in a manner set forth in the preceding paragraphs. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 210, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover as civil penalties injunctive relief and monetary civil penalties in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation per employee, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus

1 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent
2 violation in connection with each payment that was made in violation of Labor Code section 204.

3 Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 226.3

4 40. Labor Code section 226.3 states that “[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a)
5 of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250)
6 per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for
7 each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage
8 deduction statement or fails to keep the records required in subdivision (a) of Section 226.”

9 41. Labor Code section 226.3 further provides that “[t]he civil penalties provided for in
10 this section are in addition to any other penalty provided by law.”

11 42. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had
12 and have a policy or practice of failing to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by
13 intentionally failing to furnish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements
14 that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total hours worked; net wages earned; the name and
15 address of each employer with whom they have been placed to work; all applicable hourly rates in
16 effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; and
17 other such information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

18 43. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.3, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are
19 entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants’ violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision
20 (a) in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period
21 for the initial violation, and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay
22 period for each subsequent violation.

23 Violation of Labor Code § 558

24 44. Pursuant to Labor Code section 558, subdivision (a): “Any employer or other person
25 acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated . . . any provision regulating
26 hours and days of work in any of the Industrial Welfare Commission” shall be subject to a civil
27 penalty as follows:

28 (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee and for each

1 pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient
2 to recover underpaid wages;

3 (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid
4 employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to
5 an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages;

6 (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee.”

7 45. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants, and
8 each of them, violated, or caused to be violated, the Labor Code sections and Wage Orders
9 regulating wages, hours and days of work described herein, including but not limited to Labor Code
10 sections 201-204, 223, 226.7, 510, 511, 512, 551, 552, 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2802.

11 46. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
12 pursuant to Labor Code section 558, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover
13 civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount fifty dollars
14 (\$50) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars
15 (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

16 Violation of Labor Code § 1174.5

17 47. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (b) has
18 required every person employing labor in California to “[a]llow any member of the commission or
19 the employees of the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement free access to the place of business
20 or employment of the person to secure any information or make any investigation that they are
21 authorized by this chapter to ascertain or make. The commission may inspect or make excerpts,
22 relating to the employment of employees, from the books, reports, contracts, payrolls, documents,
23 or papers of the person.”

24 48. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (c) has required
25 every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep a record showing the names and addresses of
26 all employees employed and the ages of all minors.”

27 49. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d) has required
28 every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep, at a central location in the state or at the

1 plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours
2 worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and applicable
3 piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records
4 shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any
5 case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee
6 from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units
7 earned.”

8 50. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, “[a]ny person employing labor who willfully
9 fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of [Labor Code] Section 1174 or accurate
10 and complete records required by subdivision (d) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, or to allow any
11 member of the commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to subdivision
12 (b) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).

13 51. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants have
14 willfully failed to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar
15 payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment
16 under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records
17 under Labor Code section 1174.

18 52. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
19 pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
20 recover civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of five
21 hundred dollars (\$500) per violation per pay period per Aggrieved Employee.

22 Violation of Labor Code § 1197.1

23 53. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, subdivision (a): “Any employer or other
24 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, who pays
25 or causes to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or
26 local law, or by an order of the commission shall be subject to a civil penalty, restitution of wages,
27 liquidated damages payable to the employee, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
28 Section 203 as follows:

- 1 (1) For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars
2 (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
3 employee is underpaid. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
4 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
5 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.
- 6 (2) For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty
7 dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
8 employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is
9 intentionally committed. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
10 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
11 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.
- 12 (3) Wages, liquidated damages, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
13 Section 203, recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected
14 employee.”

15 54. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants caused
16 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees not to be paid minimum wages as a result of Defendants
17 routinely failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked by Plaintiff and
18 Aggrieved Employees at the proper rates of pay, as described above.

19 55. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
20 pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
21 recover civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of one
22 hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and
23 two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each
24 subsequent violation.

25 Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 2699

26 56. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), notwithstanding any other
27 provision of law, any provision of the Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed
28 and collected by the LWDA or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or

1 employees for a violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil
2 action brought by an Aggrieved Employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former
3 employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

4 57. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and
5 each of them, violated the Labor Code sections described in the preceding paragraphs.

6 58. As such, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to injunctive relief, one
7 hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee for each pay period in the PAGA Period, and
8 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each Aggrieved Employee for each pay period in the PAGA Period
9 to the extent Defendants' conduct is found to be malicious, fraudulent and/or oppressive.

10 59. Moreover, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees within the State of California
11 whom Plaintiff seeks to represent are entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in
12 connection with their herein-described claims for civil penalties.

13 ///

14 ///

15 ///

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **PRAYER**

2 **WHEREFORE**, on behalf of Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff prays for
3 judgment against Defendants as follows:

- 4 A. An award of civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558,
5 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
- 6 B. An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections
7 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
- 8 C. For equitable, including, without limitation, injunctive relief;
- 9 C. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;
- 10 D. For costs of suit incurred herein; and
- 11 E. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

12 Dated: July 31, 2026

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

13
14 BY: /s/ Jason Rothman

15 JASON ROTHMAN

16 Attorneys for Plaintiff EMILY HENG and on
17 behalf of all other Aggrieved Employees
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28