

1 Arrash T. Fattahi (SBN 333676)
2 arrash.fattahi@wilshirelawfirm.com

3 Arman A. Salehi (SBN 351112)
4 arman.salehi@wilshirelawfirm.com

5 **WILSHIRE LAW FIRM**

6 3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor
7 Los Angeles, California 90010
8 Telephone: (213) 381-9988
9 Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

11 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
12 **FOR THE COUNTY OF NAPA**

13 JOSE JUAN CASTILLO JR. & DOSTIN
14 FLORES-SOSA, on behalf of the State of
15 California and other aggrieved persons,

16 *Plaintiffs,*

17 v.

18 FIOR DI SOLE, LLC, a California limited
19 liability company; and DOES 1 through 10,
20 inclusive,

21 *Defendants.*

Case No.: 25CV000164

22 **FIRST AMENDED PAGA**
23 **REPRESENTATIVE ACTION**
24 **COMPLAINT:**

- 25 1. Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab.
26 Code § 2699, et seq.]

1 Plaintiffs JOSE JUAN CASTILLO JR. & DOSTIN FLORES-SOSA (“Plaintiffs”), based
2 upon facts that either have evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a
3 reasonable opportunity for further investigation and discovery, allege as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiffs bring this action against Defendant FIOR DI SOLE, LLC and DOES 1
6 through 10 (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for civil penalties under the
7 Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.* (“PAGA”)
8 stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time,
9 and overtime wages), failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods,
10 failure to pay all earned wages twice per month, failure to maintain accurate records of hours
11 worked and meal periods, failure to furnish accurate wage statements, and failure to indemnify for
12 necessary expenditures.

13 2. For over 50 years, California’s courts and legislature have recognized that this
14 State’s wage-and-hour laws serve a compelling public interest of fostering a stable job market.
15 Wages are not ordinary debts. Because of the economic position of the average worker and his or
16 her family, it is essential to the public welfare that employers obey the wage-and-hour laws so that
17 employees are promptly paid the minimum/overtime wages that the Legislature has required for
18 employees. So fundamental are California’s wage-and-hour laws that the Legislature has
19 criminalized certain types of violations. In extending extra protection to deter violations of these
20 underlying statutes—since Plaintiffs are not seeking general and/or special damages, restitution,
21 or other damages other than civil penalties—California has enacted the PAGA to permit an
22 individual to bring an action for PAGA penalties only, which is the precise and sole nature of this
23 action.

24 3. All California employees during the relevant statutes of limitations who are or were
25 harmed by Defendant’s illegal practices are “Aggrieved Employees.” The Aggrieved Employees
26 worked for Defendant as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the applicable statutory
27 period.

28 4. Plaintiffs bring this action against Defendants seeking only to recover penalties on

1 behalf of all Aggrieved Employees that worked for Defendants, and on behalf of the State of
2 California. Plaintiffs do not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by California
3 Labor Code Section 2699 at this time. To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for
4 wage violations, Plaintiffs do not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those
5 violations, but simply penalties as permitted by California Labor Code Section 2699, declaratory
6 relief, and injunctive relief for themselves and all Aggrieved Employees as permitted by the
7 PAGA.

8 5. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
9 establishment within the State of California, including Napa County. As such and based upon all
10 the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants are subject
11 to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC"),
12 and the California Business & Professions Code.

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

17 7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the
18 unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the
19 foregoing paragraphs as the employers of Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees. Further,
20 Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under
21 the doctrine of "respondeat superior".

22 **THE PARTIES**

23 **A. Plaintiffs**

24 8. Plaintiff JOSE JUAN CASTILLO JR. is a California resident who worked for
25 Defendants in Napa County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt from approximately July
26 2023 to approximately December 2023.

27 9. Plaintiff DOSTIN FLORES-SOSA worked for Defendants in California as an
28 hourly-paid, non-exempt employee during the past year.

1 **B. Defendants**

2 10. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based upon that information and belief
3 allege, that Defendant FIOR DI SOLE, LLC is, and at all times herein mentioned, was:

4 (a) A business entity qualified to do business and actually conducting business
5 in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Napa
6 County; and

7 (b) The former employer of Plaintiffs and the current and/or former employer
8 of the Aggrieved Employees because Defendant FIOR DI SOLE, LLC
9 suffered and permitted Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
10 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

11 11. Plaintiffs do not know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued
12 herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each
13 of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by
14 Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiffs will amend this complaint to
15 set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained,
16 together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

17 12. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and
18 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or
19 injured a significant number of the Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees in the State of
20 California.

21 13. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at all relevant times each
22 Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiffs and the
23 other employees and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiffs
24 are informed and believe and thereon allege that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the
25 principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary,
26 affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of
27 the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise
28 for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable

1 for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and
2 thereon allege that each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships
3 alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have known about, and authorized, ratified,
4 adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

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

6 14. Plaintiffs worked for Defendants in California. At all times, Defendants paid
7 Plaintiffs hourly wages and classified them as non-exempt from overtime. Defendants typically
8 scheduled Plaintiffs to work at least five days in a workweek and at least eight hours per day,
9 but Plaintiffs regularly worked more than eight hours in a workday and/or more than forty (40)
10 hours in a workweek.

11 15. Throughout Plaintiffs' employment, Defendants committed numerous labor code
12 violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiffs' experience working for Defendants was
13 typical and illustrative.

14 **A. Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Minimum, Straight Time, and**
15 **Overtime Wages**

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

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

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

27 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not
28 paying Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum, straight

1 time, and overtime wages. Defendants required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work
2 “off-the-clock,” uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved
3 Employees to perform work before clocking in for the workday, during unpaid meal periods, and
4 after clocking out for the workday. Some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime
5 rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of
6 the hours Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

7 **B. Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

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

14 21. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiffs
15 and the Aggrieved Employees with their legally mandated meal periods. Defendants regularly, but
16 not always, required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive
17 hours a day without providing an uninterrupted and duty-free meal period for every five hours of
18 work, or without compensating Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were
19 not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Instead, Defendants
20 continued to assert control over Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring,
21 or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu
22 of taking mandatory meal periods, or by denying Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees
23 permission to take a meal period. Accordingly, Defendants’ policy and practice was not to provide
24 meal periods to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

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

1 **C. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods**

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

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

19 25. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of
20 additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required
21 rest periods. Defendants, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees
22 the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized
23 and permitted to take.

24 **D. Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month**

25 26. Based on its failure to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as
26 discussed above, Defendants also violated Labor Code § 204.

27 27. Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times
28 per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action,

1 employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period
2 premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for overtime hours
3 worked. However, during all such times, Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay the
4 employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not
5 paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendants, all wages for all rest periods not
6 authorized and permitted by Defendants, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result,
7 Defendants owe employees the legally required wages not paid, and Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved
8 Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

9 **E. Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods**

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

16 29. Defendants, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all
17 meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees.

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

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

3 **F. Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

4 31. Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her
5 employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information,
6 including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-
7 rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all
8 deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated
9 and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the
10 employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security
11 number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name
12 and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect
13 during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the
14 employee. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Labor Code
15 § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

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

22 33. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiffs and the
23 Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates,
24 and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages for meal periods
25 that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for rest periods that
26 were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law).

27 34. Because Defendants violated Labor Code § 226, Plaintiffs and similarly Aggrieved
28 Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights. Accordingly, Plaintiffs

1 and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their
2 actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate
3 penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000) dollars per employee.

4 **G. Failure to Indemnify for Necessary Expenditures**

5 35. Labor Code § 2802(a) provides that employers shall indemnify his or her employees
6 for all necessary business expenditures or losses that have been incurred by the employees in direct
7 discharge of his or her duties. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause
8 of action, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses
9 that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved
10 Employees regularly paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses, including,
11 without limitation, use of personal cell phones and work attire. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved
12 Employees incurred substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for
13 Defendants, but Defendants failed to indemnify Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for these
14 employment-related expenses.

15 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of**
17 **2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.)**

18 36. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege all preceding paragraphs as though
19 fully set forth herein.

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

22 38. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action
23 to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law,
24 any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor
25 and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
26 agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a
27 civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or
28 former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3."

39. Plaintiffs have exhausted their administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3. On June 20, 2024 and December 11, 2024, they gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiffs and current and former Aggrieved Employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiffs also paid the filing fee. Plaintiffs’ PAGA case numbers are LWDA-CM-1035588-24 and LWDA-CM-1066774-24.

40. The statute of limitations is tolled while a plaintiff exhausts his or her administrative remedies with California’s LWDA prior to suit, which is required by the statute. (*See* Labor Code § 2699.3(d).)

41. At least sixty-five (65) days has elapsed since Plaintiffs provided notice, but the LWDA has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’ Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiffs may commence a civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

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

43. In addition, Plaintiffs seek an award of reasonable attorney’s fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, “Any employee who prevails in any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney’s fees and costs.”

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiffs, on behalf of all similarly aggrieved employees, pray for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. 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),

1 failing to provide meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, failing to pay all earned
2 wages twice per month, failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods,
3 failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to indemnify for necessary expenditures;

4 2. An award of civil penalties on behalf of themselves and all similarly aggrieved
5 employees pursuant to PAGA;

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

7 4. Attorneys' fees and costs reasonably incurred;


8 5. Injunctive and declaratory relief to the extent allowed by PAGA; and,

9 6. Such other and further relief that the Court deems proper.

10
11 Respectfully submitted,

12 Dated: February 14, 2025

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

13
14
15 By:  _____

Arrash T. Fattahi

Arman A. Salehi

16
17 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28