

Amit Peery, Esq. (State Bar No. 179697)
THE PEERY LAW FIRM
 4550 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd, Suite 100
 Westlake Village, California 91362
 Telephone: (818) 995-4079
 Facsimile: (818) 999-6514
 ap@peerylaw.com

Electronically FILED by
 Superior Court of California,
 County of Los Angeles
 4/21/2025 12:24 PM
 David W. Slayton,
 Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
 By D. McKinney, Deputy Clerk

Attorney for Plaintiff, David Ortega, individually
 and on behalf of himself and all aggrieved employees
 pursuant to Labor Code Section 2698 et seq.

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

DAVID ORTEGA, individually and
 on behalf of himself and all aggrieved
 employees pursuant to Labor Code
 Section 2698 et seq.;

Plaintiff,

vs.

WARVALE TRUCKING INC, a
 California corporation; ADHMAD
 DAHDOUL, an individual; ALI
 DAHDOUL, an individual; IMAD
 DAHDOUL, an individual; and DOES 1-
 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 25CMCV00665

COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1. FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME AND ALL WAGES DUE**
- 2. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU THEREOF**
- 3. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU THEREOF**
- 4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DUE UPON SEPARATION OF EMPLOYMENT**
- 5. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH WAGE STATEMENT PROVISIONS**
- 6. VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200**
- 7. INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**
- 8. NEGLIGENCE**
- 9. NEGLIGENCE PER SE**

**10. CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER
CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 2698 ET.
SEQ (PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT) NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF
EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff DAVID ORTEGA alleges individually, and with respect to the Ninth Cause of Action on behalf of himself and all aggrieved employees, as follows against all Defendants:

I.

INTRODUCTION AND PARTIES

1. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself, and with respect to the Ninth Cause of Action on behalf of himself and all Aggrieved Employees, as a result of Defendants’ (a) violation of the California Labor Code (“Labor Code”), inclusive of §§ 201-202, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 1174, 1197 and 1197.1 and non-compliance with related and applicable California Industrial Welfare Commission Orders; (b) violation of the California Code of Regulations; (c) conduct giving rise to claims and relief provided under Business & Professions Code §§ 17200-17208; and (d) intentional or no less than negligent infliction of emotional distress upon Plaintiff.

2. Venue is proper in this judicial district, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 395 because Defendants employed Plaintiff in this judicial district in Los Angeles County, California.

3. Plaintiff DAVID ORTEGA was employed by Defendants at relevant times alleged herein in Los Angeles County, California.

4. Defendant WARVALE TRUCKING INC is a California corporation engaging in business in Los Angeles County, California .

5. Defendant ADHMAD DAHDOUL is an individual residing in Los Angeles County, California.

6. Defendant ALI DAHDOUL is an individual residing in Los Angeles County, California.

7. Defendant IMAD DAHDOUL is an individual residing in Los Angeles County, California.

8. ADHMAD DAHDOUL, ALI DAHDOUL and IMAD DAHDOUL are each an owner, director, officer and/or managing agent of WARVALE TRUCKING INC and are liable for the violations alleged herein pursuant to Labor Code §558.1.

9. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 10, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues Defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the Defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known.

10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each Defendant acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendant, carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and that the acts of each Defendant is legally attributable to the other Defendants.

II.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME AND OTHER WAGES DUE

11. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 10 above as though fully set forth.

12. Labor Code §204 provides that all wages other than those mentioned in Section 201, 201.3, 202, 204.1, or 204.2, earned by any person in any employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays.

13. Labor Code §1197 makes it unlawful to pay any employee less than the minimum wage fixed by the commission or applicable law.

14. Labor Code §510 provides that any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee, and that any work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

15. Labor Code §246 provides that an employee who works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days.

16. Defendants purportedly paid Plaintiff a weekly salary irrespective of the numbers of hours he worked in a day and week.

17. While Defendants purported to pay Plaintiff a salary, Defendants would reduce the “purported” salary for days and times in a week that Plaintiff did not work.

18. Plaintiff was a non-exempt employee and was entitled to the protections of the Labor Code applicable for non-exempt employees, inclusive of the entitlement to be paid for all hours worked and overtime.

19. Defendants also may have purported to pay Plaintiff a salary but by their conduct in only paying a “salary” when it benefitted them and by reducing and deducting from that salary for various days and times Plaintiff did not work Defendants’ Plaintiff was entitled to his hourly wage for all hours worked and portion thereof and overtime.

20. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff wages for every hour or portion thereof that Plaintiff worked.

21. Plaintiff was required to and routinely worked more than eight hours a day and more than forty hours per week but was denied and never paid overtime wages as required under Labor Code §510.

22. Plaintiff worked more than 30 days for Defendants in a year but was denied and did not receive sick pay wages that she was entitled to pursuant to Labor Code §246.

23. Defendants failed to track the hours worked by Plaintiff and did not maintain required records regarding the same, in violation of Labor Code §1174.

24. The Defendants conduct alleged herein was knowing and willful.

25. As a result of the Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has been deprived of and seeks all wages due to him in amounts to be determined at trial, including the unpaid balance of the full amount of all minimum wage or overtime compensation due to him, interest thereon and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code § 1194, liquidated damages pursuant to Labor Code § 1194.2, any and all statutory penalties to which she is entitled and such other and further relief prayed for herein or as the Court deems just and proper.

IV.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS FOR

FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU THEREOF

26. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 25 above as though fully set forth.

27. Defendants employed Plaintiff and failed to provide him with required and proper rest periods or premium wages due in lieu thereof in violation of Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001.

28. Defendants had no policy of mandating or requiring rest periods.

29. Plaintiff worked but was denied and unable to take 10-minute, off duty and uninterrupted rest periods for every four (4) hours that he worked or major fraction.

30. Defendants were required but failed to pay Plaintiff one additional hour of pay at his regular rate of compensation for each day he worked without being provided the appropriate rest period(s).

31. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, Plaintiff seeks the payment of all rest period compensation which he is owed for and during a period dating back four (4) years prior to the filing of his action and continuing through the present (the “liability period”), the liability period according to proof and such other and further relief prayed for herein or as the Court deems just and proper such other relief prayed for herein.

V.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS FOR FAILURE

TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU THEREOF

32. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 31 above as though fully set forth.

33. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with compliant and required meal breaks, and also failed to pay him premium wages in lieu thereof as required by and in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001.

34. Plaintiff was employed and worked more than five hours per day and sometimes more than 10 hours per day and was denied compliant meal breaks as required by Labor Code §512 (employees employed for more than 5 hours in a day are required to be provided a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, and second meal period of not less than 30 minutes if employed for more than 10 hours in a day).

35. Plaintiff was routinely denied, and not authorized to take, a timely, uninterrupted, 30-minute meal period for every shift worked that exceeded five hours in duration, or a second timely, uninterrupted, 30-minute meal period for every shift worked that exceeded ten hours.

36. Plaintiff is entitled to one hour of pay for each day that Defendants failed to properly provide him with one or more meal periods as set forth in Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

37. Plaintiff seeks the payment of all meal period compensation which he is owed during his employment within the four years preceding the filing of his Action, according to proof, and such other and further relief prayed for herein or as the Court deems just and proper.

VI.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS FOR FAILURE TO
TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES DUE UPON SEPARATION OF EMPLOYMENT**

38. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 37 above as though fully set forth.

39. California Labor Code § 201 and § 202 require Defendants to pay employees all wages due within 72 hours after resignation of employment or on the day of termination of employment as applicable.

40. Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff at separation as required by law.

41. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to timely pay wages due at separation, the employer must, as a penalty, continue to pay the subject employee's daily wages until the back wages are paid in full or an action is commenced, not to exceed 30 days of wages.

42. Plaintiff seeks 30 days' wages as a penalty under Labor Code § 203 for Defendants' failure to timely pay legal wages at separation of employment and such further relief prayed for herein or as the Court deems just and proper.

VII.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS FOR
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH WAGE STATEMENT PROVISIONS**

43. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 42 above as though fully set forth.

44. Section 226(a) of the California Labor Code requires employers to furnish employees, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately when wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized wage statements in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee..., (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any

applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of him or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer..., and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

45. From the inception of his employment to approximately January 1, 2024, Defendants failed to provide any wage statements whatsoever to Plaintiff.

46. Commencing January 2024 Defendants began issuing wage statements to Plaintiff but they were not in compliance with Labor Code 226 and were not accurate itemized statements including by failure to accurately state all gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226(a)(1) and net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226(a)(5).

47. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Labor Code § 226(a).

48. Plaintiff is entitled to penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e) to recover the greater of all actual damages or \$50 for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and \$100 per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of \$4,000 per employee, and are entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code § 226(h) and such further relief prayed for herein or as the Court deems just and proper.

VIII.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS FOR UNFAIR COMPETITION

PURSUANT TO BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200 ET SEQ.

49. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 48 above as though fully set forth.

50. Defendants conduct with respect to Plaintiff has and remains a policy and practice aimed at voluntarily and knowingly mistreating Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees as salaried and exempt from overtime, meal and rest breaks and other protections that are provided for under California law for non-exempt employees, and wrongful failure to pay and provide Plaintiff and such other persons wages, compensation and other benefits that California employees are entitled to.

51. The conduct of all Defendants as alleged in this Complaint was unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

52. Plaintiff is a “person” within the meaning of Business & Professions Code § 17204, and therefore has standing to bring this cause of action.

53. Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq. prohibits unlawful and unfair business practices.

54. Wage and hour laws express fundamental public policies. Properly providing employees with all wages are fundamental public policies of this State and of the United States. Labor Code § 90.5(a) articulates the public policies of this State to enforce vigorously minimum labor standards, to ensure that employees are not required or permitted to work under substandard and unlawful conditions, and to protect law-abiding employers and its employees from competitors who lower their costs by failing to comply with minimum labor standards.

55. Defendants have violated statutes and public policies. Through the conduct alleged in this Complaint, Defendants, and each of them, have acted contrary to these public policies, have violated specific provisions of the Labor Code, and have engaged in other unlawful and unfair business practices in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq. depriving Plaintiff and all interested persons of rights, benefits, and privileges guaranteed to all employees under law.

56. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, constitutes unfair competition in violation of §17200 et seq. of the Business & Professions Code.

57. Defendants, by engaging in the conduct herein alleged, either knew or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known that the conduct was unlawful. As such, it is a violation of § 17200 et seq. of the Business & Professions Code.

58. As a proximate result of the above-mentioned acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has been damaged in a sum as may be proven at the time of trial.

59. Unless restrained by this Court, Defendants will continue to engage in the unlawful conduct, as alleged above. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq., this Court should make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to prevent the use or employment, by Defendants, its agents, or employees, of any unlawful or deceptive practice prohibited by the Business & Professions Code, and/or, including but not limited to, disgorgement of profits which may be necessary to restore Plaintiff the money Defendants have unlawfully failed to pay.

IX.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS FOR INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

60. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 10 above as though fully set forth.

61. Plaintiff worked for Defendants and was under their control with respect to his employment.

62. As part of Plaintiff's duties, Plaintiff was required to remain at the Defendants' facility for long periods of time.

63. For the entire duration of his employment, Defendants failed to provide and Plaintiff did not have access to a toilet facility, washing facilities and potable water for maintaining personal cleanliness.

64. Defendants were well aware of the lack of access to toilet and sanitation facilities.

65. Plaintiff complained to the Defendants about such lack of toilet and sanitation facilities on several occasions.

66. During his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff suffered from gastrointestinal conditions that affected his digestion and bowel movements and, in addition to lodging general complaints about the lack of any access to toilet and sanitations facilities, Plaintiff also made Defendants aware of his condition.

67. Plaintiff suffered greatly, physically and mentally, from and related to the fear, stress and actual consequences of not having access to toilet and sanitation facilities at work and over the related continence and incontinence.

68. Defendants completely disregarded and ignored Plaintiff's complaints about there being no toilet and sanitations facilities for him to use, his condition and the concerns around it relative to not having access to a toilet and sanitation facilities, and the known impact it was having on him.

69. Defendants conduct was outrageous and intended to cause Plaintiff embarrassment and emotional and physical distress and, at a minimum, Defendant acted with reckless disregard of the probability that Plaintiff would suffer physical and emotional distress.

70. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' intentional conduct, and each of them, Plaintiff suffered physical pain, shock, embarrassment, humiliation, emotional distress, stress and mental anguish and is entitled to special and general damages from Defendants, to be proven and determined at the time of trial.

X.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS FOR NEGLIGENCE

71. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 10 and 61 through 68 above as though fully set forth.

72. Defendants owed a general duty of care to Plaintiff to provide him with a safe and sanitary working environment.

73. Defendants breached their duty by failing to provide Plaintiff with a safe and sanitary working environment including by failing to provide Plaintiff with access to a toilet and other sanitation facilities.

74. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligent conduct, and each of them, Plaintiff suffered physical pain, shock, embarrassment, humiliation, emotional distress, stress and mental anguish and is entitled to special and general damages from Defendants, to be proven and determined at the time of trial.

XI.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS FOR NEGLIGENCE PER SE

75. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 10 above, paragraph 61 through 68 above, and paragraph 83 below, as though fully set forth.

76. Defendants violated CAL / OSHA by failing to provide proper and required sanitation facilities, including a toilet, washing facilities and potable water for maintaining personal cleanliness, and no such facilities were accessible to Plaintiff.

77. Defendants violation constitutes negligence per se.

78. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' violation of the law and negligent conduct per se, Plaintiff suffered physical pain, shock, embarrassment, humiliation, emotional distress, stress and mental anguish and is entitled to special and general damages from Defendants, to be proven and determined at the time of trial.

IX.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**PLAINTIFF AND ALL AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES AGAINST DEFENDANTS FOR
CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2698 et seq.**

79. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 59 above as though fully set forth.

80. Plaintiff alleges the following on behalf of himself and in a representative capacity on behalf of all other California employees who currently work or formerly worked for Defendants against whom one or more of the violations that Plaintiff has asserted against Defendants was committed (“Aggrieved Employees”).

81. Plaintiff seeks the recovery of all civil penalties arising from the Defendants violations pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 et seq. (the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, “PAGA”).

82. Defendants knowingly and willfully:

a. Failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees all minimum, overtime and other wages that were due to them on account of their employment with Defendants in violation of Labor Codes, including but not limited to Labor Code §§ 204, 221, 246, 510, 1174, 1197 and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Order.

b. Denied Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees compliant, off-duty 10-minute rest periods for every four (4) hours they worked or major fraction thereof, and failed to pay them premium wages of one hour’s pay for each missed rest period in lieu thereof in violation of Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001.

c. Denied Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees timely, uninterrupted and compliant 30-minute meal period for every shift worked that exceeded five hours in duration, or a second timely, uninterrupted, 30-minute meal period for every shift worked that exceeded ten hours, and failed to pay premium wages to them in lieu thereof in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and IWC Wage Order 2-2001.

d. Withheld compensation from Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §221.

e. Failed to provide Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with wage statements that fully and accurately itemized the requirements set forth in Labor Code §§ 226(a).

f. Failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees who were terminated by Defendants all wages due at the separation of their employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

83. Plaintiff also alleges the following on behalf of himself, Aggrieved Employees and the State of California with respect to their employment by Defendants and Defendants violation of the California Code of Regulations, Title 8 (CAL/OSHA), Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, Group 2, Article 9, "Sanitation":

(a) Defendants failed to provide and Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees had no access to a toilet as required by CCR §§3364 and 3365.

(b) Defendants failed to provide and Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees had no access to washing facilities for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees pursuant to CCR §3366.

(c) Defendants failed to provide potable water for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees in adequate supply pursuant to CCR §3363.

(e) Plaintiff made Defendants aware of and complained on several occasions about the lack of accessibility to a toilet, washing facilities and potable water supply.

(f) Defendants disregarded and ignored Plaintiff's complaints about there being no toilet, washing facilities or potable water supply.

(g) Defendants' failures to provide legally required sanitation facilities was intentional and knowing, as contrasted with inadvertent. Defendants were made aware of the lack of proper sanitations facilities and made no reasonable effort to eliminate the conditions.

(h) Defendants conduct was repetitive.

(i) Defendants conduct constitutes a serious violation under and no less than a general violation of the applicable laws.

84. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all Aggrieved Employees and the State of California seeks all civil penalties arising from Defendants' violations based on the facts alleged herein.

85. Pursuant to Labor Code §2699(f), excepting those provisions of the Labor Code for which a civil penalty is specifically provided which would include but not be limited to those relating to Labor Code §§226.3 (wage statements), 225.5 (withholding wages) and 558, the established penalty for all other violations would be \$100 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for

the initial violation and \$200 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

86. Pursuant to applicable law, civil penalties recovered will be allocated 65% to the LWDA and 35% to Aggrieved Employees.

87. In compliance with Labor Code §2699.3, Plaintiff filed by online submission to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by proper service upon Defendants the requisite notice setting forth the facts and theories of the violations alleged against Defendants

88. No notice was received by Plaintiff from the LWDA within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the date of submission of the requisite notice that Plaintiff submitted and therefore Plaintiff may commence this action to seek civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 et seq.

XI

RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

First through Sixth Causes of Action

(Plaintiff against each and all Defendants)

1. For all unpaid wages, including overtime wages and sick pay, and compensatory damages, according to proof;
2. For liquidated damages pursuant to Labor Code § 1194.2;
3. For meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7;
4. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203, 210, 226(e) and any and all other statutory penalties arising from Defendants’ conduct, according to proof;
5. For restitution for unfair competition pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq.;
6. Attorney fees and costs of suit;
7. Pre and post judgment interest; and
8. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Seventh Cause of Action

(Plaintiff against each and all Defendants)

1. For general damages (non-economic damages) to be determined at trial to compensate Plaintiff for all the shock, embarrassment, distress, injury, humiliation, emotional distress and stress caused by Defendants;
2. For special damages according to proof;
3. For punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial sufficient to punish, penalize and deter Defendants' conduct.
4. Costs of suit;
5. Pre and post judgment interest; and
6. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper

Eighth and Ninth Causes of Action

(Plaintiff against each and all Defendants)

1. For general damages (non-economic damages) to be determined at trial and sufficient to compensate Plaintiff for all the shock, embarrassment, distress, injury, humiliation, emotional distress and stress caused by Defendants;
2. For special damages according to proof;
3. Costs of suit;
4. Pre and post judgment interest; and
5. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper

Tenth Causes of Action

(Plaintiff for himself and Aggrieved Employees

against each and all Defendants)

1. For all civil penalties under Labor Code 2698 et seq (including civil penalties specifically provided for by applicable Codes and where a civil penalty is not specifically provided for civil penalties under Labor Code § 2699(f));

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

- 2. For the payment of costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(h), 1194, 2699(g)(1), and other applicable law;
- 3. For an award of attorneys’ fees pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(h), 1194, 1194.2, 2699(g)(1), and other applicable law; and
- 4. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

DATED: April 14, 2025

THE PEERY LAW FIRM

By: 

AMIT PEERY, Attorney for Plaintiff