

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Matthew Gustin, Esq. (SBN 310714)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
mgustin@lelawfirm.com

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
2/14/2025 2:17 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By Y. Tarasyuk, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff TRAVION D. WYATT,
on behalf of himself and current and former aggrieved employees

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES- CENTRAL DISTRICT

TRAVION D. WYATT, on behalf of himself and
current and former aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

EMCOR FACILITIES SERVICES, INC.; MESA
ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC.; EMCOR GROUP,
INC.; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **25STCV04279**

PAGA ACTION

**PLAINTIFF TRAVION D. WYATT'S
COMPLAINT FOR:**

- CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT
TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT OF 2004
("PAGA"), LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

COMES NOW Plaintiff TRAVION D. WYATT ("Plaintiff"), who alleges and complains
against Defendants EMCOR FACILITIES SERVICES, INC.; MESA ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC.,
EMCOR GROUP, INC. and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive (collectively "Defendants") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*
("PAGA") representative action brought by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California, himself
and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants who worked as hourly non-exempt
employees in California during the relevant time period seeking civil penalties associated with
Defendants' violation of the Labor Code based on Defendants' failure to pay wages for all hours

1 worked at minimum wage and all overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay; failure to pay
2 overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay; failure to authorize or permit all legally required
3 and/or compliant meal periods or pay meal period premium wages; failure to authorize or permit
4 all legally required and/or compliant rest periods or pay rest period premium wages; failure to pay
5 wages for accrued paid sick time at the regular rate of pay; statutory penalties for failure to provide
6 accurate wage statements; statutory waiting time penalties in the form of continuation wages for
7 failure to timely pay employees all wages due upon separation of employment. Plaintiff seeks on a
8 representative basis, following notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, civil
9 penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) and costs brought
10 on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and others aggrieved.

11 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

12 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of Plaintiff and all other current and
13 former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees because Plaintiff's lawsuit seeks
14 civil penalties on behalf of herself, all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
15 non-exempt employees, and the State of California in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars
16 (\$25,000); Defendants employed Plaintiff and all other current and former aggrieved California-
17 based hourly non-exempt employees; and the injuries to Plaintiff and all other current and former
18 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees occurred in locations throughout
19 California, including but not limited to Los Angeles County, at 23041 Newhall Ranch Road, Santa
20 Clarita, CA 91350.

21 **III. PARTIES**

22 1. Plaintiff brings this action as a representative of the Labor and Workforce
23 Development Agency on behalf of himself and other current and former employees subject to
24 violations of the Labor Code. The named Plaintiff and the persons on whose behalf this action is
25 filed include current, former and/or future employees of Defendants who work, worked, or will work
26 for Defendants as direct employees as well as temporary employees employed through temp
27 agencies as hourly non-exempt employees in California. At all times mentioned herein, the currently
28 named Plaintiff is and was domiciled and a resident and citizen of California and was employed by

1 Defendants in an hourly position at Defendants' location in Los Angeles from in or around 2022
2 until on or about November 14, 2024.

3 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant EMCOR
4 FACILITIES SERVICES, INC., an Ohio Corporation, is authorized to do business within the State
5 of California and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 1-20 are,
6 and at all times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant EMCOR FACILITIES
7 SERVICES, INC. in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and
8 hour practices or policies. Defendant EMCOR FACILITIES SERVICES, INC. operates in Los
9 Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County, including
10 but not limited to, at 23041 Newhall Ranch Road, Santa Clarita, CA 91350.

11 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant MESA
12 ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC., a California Corporation, is authorized to do business within the State
13 of California and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 21-40
14 are, and at all times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant MESA ENERGY
15 SYSTEMS, INC. in the establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and
16 hour practices or policies. Defendant MESA ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC. operates in Los Angeles
17 County and employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County, including but not
18 limited to, at 23041 Newhall Ranch Road, Santa Clarita, CA 91350.

19 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant EMCOR
20 GROUP, INC., a Delaware Corporation, is authorized to do business within the State of California
21 and is doing business in the State of California and/or that Defendants DOES 41-60 are, and at all
22 times relevant hereto were persons acting on behalf of Defendant EMCOR GROUP, INC. in the
23 establishment of, or ratification of, the aforementioned illegal wage and hour practices or policies.
24 Defendant EMCOR GROUP, INC. operates in Los Angeles County and employed Plaintiff and
25 aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County, including but not limited to, at 23041 Newhall Ranch
26 Road, Santa Clarita, CA 91350.

27 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 1
28 through 50 are corporations, or are other business entities or organizations of a nature unknown to

1 Plaintiff that employed Plaintiff and aggrieved California non-exempt employees, permitted
2 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work, and exercised control over the wages, hours and working
3 conditions of employment of Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

4 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants DOES 61
5 through 100 are individuals unknown to Plaintiff. Each of the individual defendants is sued
6 individually and in his or her capacity as an agent, shareholder, owner, representative, manager,
7 supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of each defendant who violated or caused to be
8 violated the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Labor Code and/or any provision of the
9 Industrial Welfare Commission's wage orders regulating hours and days of work.

10 7. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100. Plaintiff
11 sues said defendants by said fictitious names, and will amend this complaint when the true names
12 and capacities are ascertained or when such facts pertaining to liability are ascertained, or as
13 permitted by law or by the Court. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously
14 named defendants is in some manner responsible for the events and allegations set forth in this
15 complaint.

16 8. Plaintiff makes the allegations in this complaint without any admission that, as to
17 any particular allegation, Plaintiff bears the burden of pleading, proving, or persuading and Plaintiff
18 reserves all of Plaintiff's right to plead in the alternative.

19 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF**
21 **2004, LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, ET SEQ.**

22 **(Against all Defendants by Plaintiff on behalf of Themselves, the State of California, and**
23 **Other Current and Former Aggrieved Employees)**

24 9. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

25 10. During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present, Plaintiff alleges
26 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 1194,
27 1197, and the applicable Wage Orders.

28 11. Specifically, Defendants have committed the following violations of California

1 Labor Code:

2 **12. Failure to pay wages for all hours worked at the legal minimum wage:**

3 Defendants employed many of their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt
4 employees. In California, an employer is required to pay hourly employees for all “hours worked,”
5 which includes all time that an employee is under control of the employer and all time the employee
6 is suffered and permitted to work. This includes the time an employee spends, either directly or
7 indirectly, performing services which inure to the benefit of the employer.

8 **13.** Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 require an employer to compensate employees
9 for all “hours worked” at least at a minimum wage rate of pay as established by the IWC and the
10 Wage Orders.

11 **14.** In this case, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
12 non-exempt employees worked more minutes per shift than Defendants credited them with having
13 worked. Specifically, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
14 California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages at the applicable minimum wage for all
15 hours worked due to Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited
16 to:

17 (a) “Rounding down” or “shaving down” Plaintiff’s and other current and former
18 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees’ total daily hours at the time of their
19 clock-ins and clock-outs, including clock-ins and clock-outs for meal breaks, to the nearest quarter
20 of an hour, to the benefit of Defendants.

21 **15.** Therefore, Defendants suffered, permitted, and required Plaintiff and other current
22 and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to be subject to Defendants’
23 control without paying wages for that time. This resulted in Plaintiff and other current and former
24 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees working time for which they were not
25 compensated any wages, in violation of Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 and the applicable
26 Wage Order.

27 **16. Failure to pay wages for overtime hours worked at the overtime rate of pay**
28 **and/or failure to pay overtime wages at the proper rate of pay:** Defendants employed many of

1 their employees, including Plaintiff, as hourly non-exempt employees. In California, an employer
2 is required to pay hourly employees for all “hours worked,” which includes all time that an employee
3 is under control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered and permitted to work. This
4 includes the time an employee spends, either directly or indirectly, performing services that inure to
5 the benefit of the employer.’

6 17. Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 require an employer to compensate employees a
7 higher rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, in excess of forty (40)
8 hours in a workweek, and on any seventh consecutive day of work in a workweek:

9 Any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, any work in excess of forty (40) hours
10 in any one (1) workweek, and the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in
11 any one (1) workweek, shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one-and-one-half
12 (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of twelve (12) hours
13 in one (1) day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay
14 for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a
15 workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an
16 employee.

17 Labor Code section 510.

18 18. In this case, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
19 California-based hourly non-exempt employees overtime wages for all overtime hours worked due
20 to Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to:

21 (a) “Rounding down” or “shaving down” Plaintiff’s and other current and former
22 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees’ total daily hours at the time of their
23 clock-ins and clock-outs, including clock-ins and clock-outs for meal breaks, to the nearest quarter
24 of an hour, to the benefit of Defendants.

25 19. Furthermore, overtime is based upon an employee’s regular rate of pay. “The regular
26 rate at which an employee is employed shall be deemed to include all remuneration for employment
27 paid to, or on behalf, of the employee.” See Division of Labor Standards Enforcement –
28 Enforcement Policies and Interpretations Manual, Section 49.1.2.

29 20. In this case, Plaintiff alleges that when he and other current and former aggrieved
30 California-based hourly non-exempt employees earned overtime wages, Defendants failed to pay
31 them overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay due to Defendants’ failure to include all

1 remuneration when calculating the overtime rate of pay. Specifically, Defendants maintained a
2 policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as sign-on bonus pay
3 example, when calculating Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based
4 hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying overtime.

5 21. The foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time during each
6 workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
7 employees were under the control of Defendants but were not compensated. To the extent that the
8 foregoing uncompensated time occurred when Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
9 California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday,
10 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) days in a workweek, Defendants failed
11 to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code
12 sections 510, 1194 and 1198, and the applicable Wage Order.

13 22. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
14 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant meal periods and/or failure to**
15 **pay period premium wages:** Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
16 hourly non-exempt employees regularly worked shifts of more than five (5) hours in length and
17 shifts of more than ten (10) hours in length.

18 23. California law requires an employer to authorize or permit an employee an
19 uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of
20 all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the
21 employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198; Wage Order 1 at §11;
22 *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ
23 an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee
24 with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh
25 hour of work. *Id.* If the employee is not relieved of all duty during a meal period, the meal period
26 shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. A paid "on duty" meal
27 period is only permitted when: (1) the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved
28 of all duty; and (2) the parties have a written agreement agreeing to on-duty meal periods.

1 24. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
2 law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay
3 for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code
4 sections 226.7 and 1198; Wage Order 1 at §11.

5 25. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit legally required and compliant
6 meal periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
7 exempt employees due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures, including but not
8 limited to:

9 (a) "Rounding down" or "shaving down" Plaintiff's and other current and former
10 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' total daily hours at the time of their
11 clock-ins and clock-outs for meal breaks, to the nearest quarter of an hour, to the benefit of
12 Defendants.

13 (b) Requiring Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
14 non-exempt employees to keep their employer-issued work phones on their person and to monitor
15 them during their shift at times resulting in Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
16 California-based hourly non-exempt employees remaining on duty at times during their off-the-
17 clock meal breaks.

18 (c) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
19 hourly non-exempt employees a second uninterrupted duty-free meal period of no less than thirty
20 (30) minutes for each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-
21 based hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

22 26. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
23 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
24 hourly non-exempt employees one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday that
25 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees did
26 not receive legally required and compliant meal periods, in violation of Labor Code section 226.7.

27 27. Finally, on occasions when Defendants paid Plaintiff and other current and former
28 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a "premium" wage for late, missed, short,

1 on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted meal periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1) additional
2 hour of pay at Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
3 exempt employees' regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy,
4 practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as sign-on bonus pay for
5 example, when calculating Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based
6 hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying meal period premium
7 wages.

8 28. Defendants' foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff and
9 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not receiving
10 wages to compensate them for workdays during which Defendants did not provide them with meal
11 periods in compliance with California law.

12 29. **Failure to pay wages to hourly non-exempt employees for workdays that**
13 **Defendants failed to provide legally required and compliant rest periods and/or failure to pay**
14 **rest period premium:** Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
15 non-exempt employees regularly worked shifts of more than three-and-a-half (3.5) hours.

16 30. California law requires every employer to authorize and permit an employee a rest
17 period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. Labor Code
18 section 226.7; Wage Order 1 at §12. Under California law, "[e]mployees are entitled to 10 minutes'
19 rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six
20 hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on." *Brinker*
21 *Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code section 226.7;
22 Wage Order 1 at §12. Rest periods, insofar as practicable, shall be in the middle of each work period.
23 Wage Order 1 at §12. Additionally, the rest period requirement "obligates employers to permit –
24 and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods." *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*,
25 (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all
26 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.*

27 31. If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer must
28 pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday the

1 employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7; Wage
2 Order 1 at § 12.

3 32. In this case, Defendants failed to authorize or permit all legally required and
4 compliant rest periods to Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
5 non-exempt employees due to Defendants' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not
6 limited to:

7 (a) Requiring Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly
8 non-exempt employees to remain on-duty at times during their rest breaks because Plaintiff and
9 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees were required
10 to keep their employer-issued work phone on them at times during their shifts to monitor and
11 respond to calls from Defendant, including during rest breaks.

12 (b) Failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
13 hourly non-exempt employees a third uninterrupted duty-free rest period of no less than ten (10) net
14 minutes on each workday that Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
15 hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

16 33. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants maintained a policy, practice, and/or
17 procedure of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
18 hourly non-exempt employees with one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday
19 they did not receive legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor Code section
20 226.7.

21 34. Finally, on occasions when Defendants did pay Plaintiff and other current and former
22 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a "premium" wage for late, missed, short,
23 on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted rest periods, Defendants failed to pay the one (1) additional
24 hour of pay at Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
25 exempt employees' regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy,
26 practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such sign-on bonus pay for example,
27 when calculating Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
28 exempt employees' regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying rest period premiums.

1 35. Defendants' foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Plaintiff and
2 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees not receiving
3 wages to compensate them for workdays in which Defendants did not provide them with rest periods
4 in compliance with California law.

5 36. **Failure to provide sick pay wages:** Defendants had a policy and/or procedure where
6 Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees
7 accrued paid sick time.

8 37. Labor Code section 246, subdivision (a), states in relevant part "[a]n employee
9 who...works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the
10 commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days." Additionally, an employee accrues
11 paid sick days at the rate of no-less-than one (1) hour per every thirty (30) hours worked, beginning
12 at the commencement of employment. Labor Code section 246(b).

13 38. Here, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
14 exempt employees were employed by Defendants for 30 or more days and were entitled to paid sick
15 days. Defendants, however, lacked a policy, practice, and/or procedure whereby Plaintiffs and other
16 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees who were employed
17 by Defendants for 30 days or more could accrue paid sick days at the rate of no-less-than one (1)
18 hour per every thirty (30) hours worked, beginning at the commencement of employment as required
19 by Labor Code section 246(b).

20 39. In this case, Plaintiff alleges that when he and other current and former aggrieved
21 California-based hourly non-exempt employees elected to use paid sick time, Defendants failed to
22 pay them sick time wages at the proper sick time rate of pay due to Defendants' failure to include
23 all remuneration when calculating the sick time rate of pay. Specifically, Defendants maintained a
24 policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration including but not limited to
25 sign-on bonus pay for example, when calculating Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved
26 California-based hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying sick
27 time.

28 40. Defendants' foregoing policy, practice, and/or procedure resulted in Defendants

1 failing to provide Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
2 exempt employees' paid sick days, in violation of Labor Code section 246.

3 41. **Failure to timely pay earned wages during employment:** In California, wages
4 must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the
5 employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code section 204(a). Wages earned
6 between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 16th and
7 the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any
8 calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. *Id.* Other payroll
9 periods such as those that are weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly, must be paid within seven (7)
10 calendar days following the close of the payroll period in which wages were earned. Labor Code
11 section 204(d).

12 42. As a derivative of Plaintiff's claims above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to
13 timely pay Plaintiff's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt
14 employees' earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages
15 and/or rest period premium wages), in violation of Labor Code section 204. Defendants'
16 aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in their failure to pay Plaintiff's and
17 other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' their earned
18 wages within the applicable time frames outlined in Labor Code section 204.

19 43. **Secret payment of lower wages than designated by statute:** Labor Code section
20 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated
21 wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage
22 designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by
23 failing to: pay overtime wages at the applicable legal overtime rate, meal break premiums and lawful
24 sick pay at the employees' regular rate of pay, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 246,
25 510, 1194 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor
26 Code section 1198, the Defendant secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while
27 purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223.

28 44. **Failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements:** Labor Code section

1 226, subdivision (a). Labor Code section 226(a) provides, *inter alia*, that, upon paying an employee
2 his or her wages, the employer must “furnish each of his or her employees ... an itemized statement
3 in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any
4 employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
5 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare
6 Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
7 is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided, that all deductions made on written orders
8 of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive
9 dates of the pay period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her
10 social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all
11 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
12 worked at each hourly rate by the employee.”

13 45. As a result of Defendants’ knowing and intentional failure to pay Plaintiff and other
14 current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages earned
15 (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period
16 premium wages) Plaintiff’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-
17 exempt employees’ wage statements were rendered inaccurate, in violation of Labor Code section
18 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9). As such Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved California-based
19 hourly non-exempt employees were unable to promptly and easily determine the accurate
20 information required by Labor Code section 226(a).

21 46. **Failure to pay employees all wages due at time of termination/resignation:** An
22 employer is required to pay all unpaid wages timely after an employee’s employment ends. The
23 wages are due immediately upon termination (Labor Code section 201) or within seventy-two (72)
24 hours of resignation (Labor Code section 202).

25 47. As a result of the aforementioned willful violations of the Labor Code, Employee
26 alleges that she was not paid his final wages in a timely manner as required by Labor Code section
27 203. Earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages,
28 and/or rest period premium wages) (all described above), were not paid at the time of Employee’s

1 separation of employment. Employee is informed and believes and thereon alleges that former
2 aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees who separated from Employer, whether
3 voluntarily or involuntarily, were not paid all wages due in a timely manner, as required by Labor
4 Code sections 201, 202, and 203. Labor Code sections 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g) authorize an
5 aggrieved employee, on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees, to bring
6 a civil action to recover civil penalties against all Defendants pursuant to the procedures specified
7 in Labor Code section 2699.3.

8 48. Labor Code sections 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee,
9 on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees, to bring a civil action to
10 recover civil penalties against all Defendants pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code
11 section 2699.3.

12 49. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
13 section 2699.3. On December 10, 2024, Plaintiff filed a PAGA Claim Notice with the LWDA and
14 provided notice to Defendants by certified mail which provided notice of the specific provisions of
15 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
16 violations alleged.

17 50. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, the LWDA must give written notice by
18 certified mail to the parties that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code
19 within 60 days of the date of the complainant's written notice. The LWDA failed to provide the
20 parties notice within 60 days of the date of Plaintiff's PAGA Claim Notice that the LWDA intends
21 to investigate Plaintiff's claims.

22 51. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff is entitled to recover civil
23 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7,
24 246, 510, 512, 1194, and 1197., During Plaintiff's employment and continuing through the present,
25 preceding Plaintiff sending the initial PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA to the present, in the
26 following amounts:

27 a. For violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, and 1197
28 one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and

two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)].

b. For violations of Labor Code section 226(a), alternatively, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, one thousand dollars (\$1000) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 226.3].

c. For violations of Labor Code section 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50) for each employee for each pay period for the initial violation, and for each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 558].

d. For violations of Labor Code section 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and 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 [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 210].

e. For violations of Labor Code section 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee in any initial violation, and 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 [penalty amounts established by Labor Code section 225.5].

52. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g), Plaintiff is entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with his claims for civil penalties.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND ON OTHER AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:

ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

1. That Defendants be found to have violated the provisions of the Labor Code and the IWC Wages Orders as to the Plaintiff and aggrieved employees;

1 2. For any and all legally applicable penalties during the relevant statute of limitations
2 subject to any permissible tolling, including but not limited to those recoverable under the California
3 Labor Code, including but not limited to sections 210, 225.5, 226.3, 558, 2699(f);

4 3. For attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including but not limited to those recoverable
5 under California Labor Code section 2699(g); and

6 4. For such and other further relief, in law and/or equity, as the Court deems just or
7 appropriate.

8
9 Dated: February 14, 2025

Respectfully submitted,
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

10
11 By: /s/ Matthew J. Gustin
12 Joseph Lavi, Esq.
13 Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
14 Matthew Gustin, Esq.
15 Attorneys for Plaintiff
16 TRAVION D. WYATT, on behalf of himself and
17 current and former aggrieved employees
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28