Electronically Submitted on 10/29/2026 03:41 PM

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of Solano
10/29/2026 at 03:41:50 PM
By: S. McClure, Deputy Clerk

BOKHOUR LAW GROUP, P.C.
Mehrdad Bokhour, Esq., CA Bar No. 285256
mehrdad@bokhourlaw.com
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 520
Los Angeles, California 90067
Tel: (310) 975-1493; Fax: (310) 675-0861

FALAKASSA LAW, P.C.
Joshua S. Falakassa, CA Bar No. 295045
josh@falakassalaw.com
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 520
Los Angeles, California 90067
Tel: (818) 456-6168; Fax: (888) 505-0868

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Putative Classes

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SOLANO

TODD JONES, MARQUESIONAE JONES AND TORREY HOLDEN, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

OPM SERVICES, LLC., a California Limited Liability Company; COAST ENVIRONMENTAL DUCT CLEANING, INC., a California corporation; and ALLIANCE ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP, LLC, California Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1-50, inclusive.

Defendants.

CASE NO.: CU26-08145

FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND PAGA ACTION COMPLAINT:

(1) FAILURE TO PAY ALL MINIMUM WAGES;
(2) FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME WAGES;
(3) MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS;
(4) REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS;
(5) FAILURE TO PAY ALL SICK TIME;
(6) WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS;
(7) WAITING TIME PENALTIES;
(8) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENSES;
(9) UNFAIR COMPETITION;
(10) PAGA PENALTIES

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs Todd Jones, Marquesionae Jones and Torrey Holden (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated non-exempt employees, alleges and complains of Defendants OPM Services, LLC, Coast Environmental Duct Cleaning, Inc., and Alliance Environmental Group, LLC and DOES 1 to 50 (collectively, "Defendants") and each of them, as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Defendants provide services relating to the operation, administration, maintenance, and support of commercial or other facilities, including functions necessary to maintain and manage buildings and their day-to-day operations.

2. Plaintiffs bring this class action lawsuit against Defendants for alleged violations of the California Labor Code and Business and Professions Code.

3. As set forth below, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked due to its failure to record and pay for all time worked off the clock. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants failed to pay all overtime and sick pay compensation at the proper legal rates by failing to properly calculate the "regular rate of pay." Moreover, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' meal and rest period policies and practices failed to allow and permit non-exempt employees to take all compliant and timely meal and rest periods or pay premium wages at the "regular rate of pay" in lieu thereof. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants failed to provide non-exempt employees with accurate written itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226(a), failed to reimburse all necessary business expenses incurred and failed to timely pay all final wages upon separation of employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203.

4. Plaintiffs also bring a claim for civil penalties based on the foregoing Labor Code violations under the Private Attorney General Act ("PAGA").

5. Based on these alleged Labor Code violations, Plaintiffs now bring this class action and representative action to recover unpaid wages, restitution, penalties, and other related relief for themselves and all other similarly situated non-exempt employees.

/ / /

/ / /

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated employees hereby bring this class action for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under California Labor Code §§ 201-203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226(a)(6), 226(e), 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 516, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1199, 2802-2804, and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders ("Wage Orders"), in addition to seeking declaratory relief and restitution pursuant to California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq*.

7. This class action is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

8. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders because the amount in controversy exceeds this Court's jurisdictional minimum.

9. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 395(a) and 395.5, Defendants operates in California within the County of Solano, and Defendants is within the jurisdiction of this Court for purposes of service of process.

PARTIES

10. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiffs, who are over 18, was and currently are California residents residing in the State of California.

11. Plaintiffs are informed, believes, and alleges that Defendants are authorized to do business within the County of Solano and are and/or were the legal employer of Plaintiffs and the Class Members during the applicable statutory periods. Plaintiffs were, and are, a victim of Defendants' policies and/or practices complained of herein and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed to them by California Labor Code §§ 201-203, 204, 210, 226, 226(a), 226(e), 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 516, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1199, 2802-2804, and the California Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq*., and applicable Wage Orders.

12. Plaintiffs are informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the four years preceding the filing of the Complaint and continuing to the present, Defendants did (and continue to do) business in the State of California, County of Solano.

13. Plaintiffs do not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or corporate, of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 50, inclusive, and for that reason, said Defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiffs will seek leave from this Court to amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiffs are informed, and believe, and thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious Defendants, whether individual, partners, or corporate, was responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein, and proximately caused Plaintiffs and the Classes to be subject to the unlawful employment practices alleged herein.

14. Plaintiffs are informed, and believe, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, Defendants were and are the employers of Plaintiffs and all members of the Classes. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants. Furthermore, the Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each and every one of the other Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned, were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment. Defendants, and each of them, approved of, condoned, and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts or omissions complained of herein.

15. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of and engaged in a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise and acting within the course and scope of and in pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise. Further, Plaintiffs allege that all Defendants were joint employers for all purposes of Plaintiffs and all members of the Classes.

COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

16. Defendants provide services relating to the operation, administration, maintenance, and support of commercial or other facilities, including functions necessary to maintain and manage buildings and their day-to-day operations.

17. Plaintiff Todd Jones was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in the role of "Cleaning Technician" from December 2024 to March 2026. Based in Fairfield, California, Plaintiffs was responsible for a variety of tasks, including, but not limited to, cleaning filters, ducts,

and grease trap.

18. Alongside Plaintiffs, other non-exempt employees, including but not limited to Abatement Technician, Cleaning Technician, Carpenter, HVAC Technician, and Insulator, played a critical role in supporting Defendants' daily operations and overall success across California.

19. Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees were responsible for a wide range of tasks critical to Defendants' operations, such as asbestos and hazardous material abatement, conducting cleaning and janitorial services, performing carpentry work and repairs, installing, maintaining, and repairing heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems, and performing related building maintenance and support services. Their work ensured the effective operation of Defendants' assets. Despite the essential nature of their contributions, Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees allege that Defendants failed to comply with the California Labor Code, including but not limited to proper wage payment and provision of meal and rest periods, as set forth below.

20. At all relevant times, Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees regularly worked various shifts, many of which were more than 8.0 hours in a workday and 40.0 hours in a workweek. Plaintiffs alleges that other non-exempt employees were also subjected to the same policies, procedures, practices, working conditions, and corresponding wage and hour violations to which they were subjected during their employment.

21. First, at all relevant times, Defendants have consistently failed to accurately record and pay for all time worked, including the time non-exempt employees were under the employer's control. This included a policy and practice of failing to properly record the time worked by non-exempt employees, including all time spent working off the clock. As a result of this company-wide policy and practice, Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees were not compensated for all hours worked, including overtime, in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1199, and applicable Wage Orders.

22. As a result of Defendants' unlawful timekeeping and off the clock work policies and practices, Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees were not properly paid for all hours worked in violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1199, and applicable Wage Orders. Additionally, due to the unlawful timekeeping policies and practices, Plaintiffs and other non-exempt

employees were not properly paid at the correct overtime rate for hours worked in excess of 8 hours per shift in violation of Labor Code § 510.

23. Labor Code § 1197.1 authorizes employees who are paid less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or local law or by an order of the commission a civil penalty, restitution of wages, and liquidated damages as follows: (1) for any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars ($100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is underpaid....[and] (2) [f]or each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty dollars ($250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation was intentionally committed.

24. Labor Code § 510 requires an employer to compensate an employee who works more than eight (8) hours in one workday, forty (40) hours in a workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh consecutive day, no less than one and one-half times (11/2) the regular rate of pay. In addition, Labor Code § 510 obligates employers to compensate employees at no less than twice the regular rate of pay when an employee works more than twelve (12) hours in a workday or more than eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work. Pursuant to Section 3 of the applicable Wage Orders, non-exempt employees shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or more than 40 hours in any workweek unless the employee receives one and one-half (11/2) times such employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours in the workweek.

25. Furthermore, at all relevant times, Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees worked regular shifts that lasted longer than 8.0 hours in a workday and resulted in non-exempt employees regularly working more than 40 hours in a workweek. However, Defendants uniformly failed to properly calculate and pay overtime wages at the proper legal rate due to Defendants' failure to include all forms of compensation/remuneration, including, but not limited to, stipends, shift pay, non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, incentives, and all other forms of remuneration in calculating the "regular rate of pay" for purposes of overtime compensation.

26. Under the California Labor Code (as well as the FLSA), courts have consistently held that regularly paid non-discretionary bonuses (and other forms of pay) must be included in determining an employee's "regular rate of pay" for purposes of calculating overtime. (See *Haber v.*

The Americana Corp. 378 F. 2d 854, 855-856 (9th Cir. 1967) [holding that regularly paid efficiency bonuses must be included in calculating the "regular rate"]; *Wang v. Chinese Daily News*, Inc. 435 F. Supp. 2d 1042, 1055-1057 (C.D. Cal. 2006) [granting summary judgment to Plaintiffs under California and federal law on the grounds that Defendants improperly calculated overtime by excluding annual bonuses paid to employees from the "regular rate of compensation"]; see *Walling v. Youngerman-Reynolds Hardwood Co*. (1945) 65 S.Ct. 1242, 1245. ("The regular rate by its very nature must reflect all payments which the parties have agreed shall be received regularly during the workweek, exclusive of overtime payments. It is not an arbitrary label chosen by the parties but an actual fact. Once the parties have decided upon the amount of wages and the mode of payment, the determination of the regular rate becomes a matter of mathematical computation, the result of which is unaffected by any designation of a contrary 'regular rate' in the contracts."); see also 29 CFR §§ 778.110 ("production bonus") and 778.111 ("piece-rate").

27. Labor Code § 510 requires an employer to compensate an employee who works more than eight (8.0) hours in one workday, forty (40.0) hours in a workweek, and for the first eight (8.0) hours worked on the seventh consecutive day, no less than one and one-half times (11/2) the regular rate of pay. In addition, Labor Code § 510 obligates employers to compensate employees at no less than twice the regular rate of pay when an employee works more than twelve (12.0) hours in a workday or more than eight (8.0) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work. Pursuant to Section 3 of the applicable Wage Orders, non-exempt employees shall not be employed more than eight (8.0) hours in any workday or more than 40.0 hours in any workweek unless the employee receives one and one-half (11/2) times such employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours in the workweek.

28. By their policy of requiring Plaintiffs and the other non-exempt employees to work in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or forty (40) hours in a workweek without compensating them at the lawful rate of one-half (1 1/2) their "regular rate of pay," Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code § 510 and the applicable Wage Orders.

29. Similarly, at all relevant times, Defendants also failed in their obligation to provide Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees the legally required paid sick days at the legal rate

pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246(a),(b), which requires that "[a]n employee who, on or after July 1, 2015, 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. . . at the rate of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked, beginning at the commencement of employment." Labor Code § 246(l)(1) provides that paid sick time for non-exempt employees must be "calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek."

30. Additionally, Labor Code § 246(l)(2) states that the paid sick time must be "calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment." Finally, Labor Code §246(i) requires employers to "provide an employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either the employee's itemized wage statement described in Section 226 or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee's payment of wages."

31. Here, at all relevant times, Defendants failed in their obligation to provide Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees the legally required paid sick days at the legal rate, including all forms of compensation, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246(a), (b). As such, Defendants paid sick time below the "regular rate of pay" as required by Labor Code §§ 246(l) (1-2).

32. Moreover, at all relevant times, Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees were denied compliant and timely 30-minute off-duty meal periods as mandated by California law. Due to Defendants' uniform meal period policies/practices, operational requirements, and work demands, Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees often could not take timely and uninterrupted net 30-minute first meal periods before the end of the fifth hour of work. Further, when Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees worked more than 10.0 hours in a shift, they were not allowed and permitted to take a mandated second meal period before the end of the tenth hour of work in violation of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders. Indeed, Plaintiffs' and other non-exempt employees' meal periods were often interrupted and/or lasted fewer than 30 minutes due to Defendants' meal period policies/procedures, operational requirements, and work demands.

33. In addition, for each missed or non-compliant meal period, Defendants failed and continues to fail to maintain a mechanism by which non-exempt employees were paid meal period premiums at the "regular rate of pay" pursuant to *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 5th 858 and Labor Code § 226.7.

34. Accordingly, due to Defendants' uniform meal period practices, non-exempt employees were also regularly denied legally compliant meal periods in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 510, 516, and applicable Wage Orders.

35. Next, at all relevant times, Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees were not provided with all 10-minute rest periods for every four hours worked, or a major fraction thereof, due to Defendants' uniform rest period policies/practices, operational requirements and work demands. As a result, Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees were and are often unable to take a net 10-minute duty-free rest period for every major fraction of four hours worked. This includes a second rest period for shifts in excess of six hours and a third rest period for shifts in excess of 10.0 hours in a workday.

36. By not relieving all non-exempt employees of all duties during rest periods, Defendants failed to provide legally compliant rest periods. See *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc*. (2016) 2 Cal. 5th 257, 269 [concluding that "during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time."] (Emphasis added). In *Augustus*, the California Supreme Court expressly rejected the employer's assertion that it could provide an on-duty rest period to employees who worked as security guards and further explained: "that employers [must] relinquish any control over how employees spend their break time and relieve their employees of all duties." *Id*. at 273. Each time non-exempt employees could not take a compliant rest period; Defendants failed and continues to fail to adequately pay rest period premium payments at the "regular rate of pay" as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

37. Accordingly, due to Defendants' uniform rest period policies/practices, non-exempt employees were regularly denied legally compliant rest breaks in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and applicable Wage Orders.

38. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees for all hours they were subject to the control of Defendants, including all minimum, overtime and sick pay wages, and Defendants' failure to pay all meal and rest period premiums at the "regular rate of pay," Defendants issued wage statements which failed to identify the gross wages earned accurately, the total hours worked, the net wages earned, and the correct corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1, 2, 5, and 9).

39. Labor Code § 226.3 provides that "[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a) of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars ($250) per employee per violation in an initial violation and one thousand dollars ($1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage deduction statement or fails to keep the required in subdivision (a) of Section 226."

40. Thus, for the violations of Labor Code section 226 described above, Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees may also recover Labor Code § 226.3 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code § 226(a). Consequently, because Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees would be entitled to recover penalties under Labor Code § 226(e).

41. Moreover, because Defendants failed to pay all minimum overtime and sick pay wages, and meal and rest period premiums at the "regular rate of pay," Defendants also failed and continues to fail to pay Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees all wages owed at their time of separation from employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203. Thus, non-exempt employees would be entitled to recover waiting time penalties under Labor Code §§ 201-203.

42. Finally, at all relevant times, Defendants required Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees to incur necessary expenses for work-related purposes but did not reimburse non-exempt employees adequately for these necessary expenditures in violation of Labor Code §§ 2802-2804. Here, Defendants uniformly failed to reimburse non-exempt employees for the necessary costs incurred in discharging their duties. (*See Cochran v. Schwan's Home Service, Inc.,* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1144 ["[i]f an employee is required to make work-related calls on a personal cell phone, then he or she is incurring an expense for the purposes of section 2802. It does not matter

whether the phone bill is paid for by a third person or at all...To show liability under section 2802, an employee needs only to show that he or she was required to use a personal cell phone to make work-related calls, and he or she was not reimbursed"].) Accordingly, due to Defendants' uniform failure to adequately reimburse for necessary business expenditures in violation of Labor Code §§ 2802-2804 and applicable Wage Orders.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

43. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and the following Classes pursuant to § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure:

> All current or former non-exempt hourly employees who work or worked for Defendants in California during the four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint through the date of trial. (the "Class");
>
> All current or former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in California and worked overtime hours during at least one shift during the four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint through the date of trial. ("the Overtime Subclass");
>
> All current or former employees who work or worked for Defendants in California during the one year immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint through the date of trial. ("the Wage Statement Subclass")
>
> All employees who work or worked for Defendants in California and who left their employment during the three years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint through the date of trial. ("Waiting Time Penalty Subclass")
>
> (collectively "the Classes")

44. **Numerosity/Ascertainability**: The members of the Classes are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and not practicable. The membership of the Classes is unknown to Plaintiffs at this time; however, it is estimated that the Classes consist of at least one hundred (100) individuals. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants' employment and payroll records.

45. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well-Defined Community of Interest**: There are common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiffs and all other similarly situated non-exempt employees, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members

including, without limitation to:

1. Whether Defendants failed to record and pay for all hours worked by Class Members;

2. Whether Defendants failed to properly calculate the "regular rate of pay" for purposes of paying overtime and sick pay wages to the members of the Class;

3. Whether Defendants provided legally compliant meal and rest periods or proper compensation at the "regular rate of pay" in lieu thereof to members of the Class;

4. Whether Defendants furnished legally compliant wage statements to members of the Wage Statement Subclass pursuant to Labor Code § 226(a);

5. Whether the timing and amount of payment of final wages to members of the Waiting Time Penalty Subclass at the time of separation from employment were unlawful; and

6. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Class Members for all necessary business expenses in violation of Labor Code §§ 2802-2804.

46. **Predominance of Common Questions**: Common questions of law and fact predominate over questions that affect only individual members of the Classes. The common questions of law set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendants' policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member, such as without limitation, Defendants' failure to pay for all hours worked, Defendants' failure to properly pay overtime and sick pay wages, Defendants' failure to provide all compliant meal and rest periods or premiums at the "regular rate of pay" in lieu thereof, Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, Defendants' failure to pay for all wages due upon separation of employment, and Defendants' failure to reimburse for all necessary business expenses. As such, the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each class member's showing as to his or her eligibility for recovery or the amount of his or her damages.

47. **Typicality**: The claims of Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Classes because Plaintiffs was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the statute(s) of limitation applicable to each cause of action pled in the Complaint in this action. As alleged herein, Plaintiffs, like the members of the Classes, was deprived of minimum, overtime and sick pay wages, was deprived of meal and rest period premium wages, was subject to Defendants' uniform meal and

rest period policies/practices, was not provided accurate itemized wage statements, was not timely paid all wages owed upon separation of employment, and was not reimbursed for all necessary business expenses.

48. **Adequacy of Representation**: Plaintiffs is fully prepared to take all necessary steps to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the members of the Classes. Moreover, Plaintiffs' attorneys are ready, willing, and able to fully and adequately represent the members of the Classes. Plaintiffs' attorneys have prosecuted and are actively litigating several wage-and-hour class actions in state and federal courts and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the members of the Classes.

49. **Superiority**: The California Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves an important public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California. These laws and labor standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers who have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to take advantage of superior economic and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of employment. The nature of this action and the format of laws available to Plaintiffs and members of the Classes make the class action format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to redress the violations alleged herein. If each employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily gain an unconscionable advantage since they could exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of each individual Plaintiffs with their vastly superior financial and legal resources.

50. Moreover, requiring each member of the Classes to pursue an individual remedy would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file an action against their former and/or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent damages to their careers at subsequent employment. Further, the prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members, even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein and which would establish potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or legal determinations with respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interest of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which

would substantially impair or impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. Further, the claims of the individual members of the class are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual prosecution considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending thereto. As such, the Classes identified in Paragraph 43 are maintainable as Classes under § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTSS)

51. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

52. Section 4 of the applicable Wage Order(s) and Labor Code §§ 1197 and 1182.12 establish the right of employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state law. Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal minimum wage as required by Labor Code § 1197 may recover the unpaid balance together with attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid wages and interest accrued thereon.

53. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to accurately record all time worked, including time spent working off the clock. Accordingly, Plaintiffs and members of the Classes were not compensated for all hours worked, including all hours they were subject to the control of Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

54. Labor Code § 1198 makes an employee's employment unlawful under conditions the Industrial Welfare Commission prohibits. Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage is liable to pay those employees the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages due and interest thereon.

55. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged herein, Plaintiffs and the Classes have sustained economic damages, including but not limited to unpaid wages and lost interest, in an amount to be established at trial, and they are entitled to recover economic and statutory damages and penalties and other appropriate relief as a result of Defendants'

violations of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

56. Defendants' practice and uniform administration of corporate policy regarding illegal employee compensation is unlawful and creates an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiffs and members of the Classes in a civil action for the unpaid amount of minimum wages, liquidated damages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 204, 558, 1194 *et seq*., 1197, 1198, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME WAGES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTSS)

57. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

58. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to overtime wages for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

59. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly pay Plaintiffs and members of the Overtime Subclass for all overtime hours worked pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194 and the applicable Wage Orders.

60. Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order requires an employer to pay an employee "one and one-half (1l⁄2) times the employee's regular rate of pay" for work in excess of 8 hours per workday and/or in excess of 40 hours of work in the workweek. The same section also requires an employer to pay an employee double the employee's regular rate of pay for work in excess of twelve hours each workday and/or for work in excess of 8 hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in the workweek. Defendants caused Plaintiffs to work overtime and hours but did not compensate Plaintiffs or members of the Overtime Subclass at one and one-half times their "regular rate of pay" for such hours.

61. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to conform their pay practices to the requirements of the law. This unlawful conduct includes, but is not limited to, Defendants' failure to pay for all hours properly worked off the clock as alleged herein above, and Defendants' failure to

include all forms of compensation, including, but not limited to, stipends, shift pay, non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, and incentive pay, in calculating the "regular rate of pay," which resulted in these individuals not being paid for all overtime hours worked.

62. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiffs and the members of the Overtime Subclass in a civil action for the unpaid amount of overtime wages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 1194, and 1198, the applicable Wage Orders, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTSS)

63. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

64. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to provide all of their hourly non-exempt employees, including Plaintiffs and members of the Class, with all required meal periods in accordance with the mandates of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders, for the reasons set forth in the Common Allegations section of this Complaint.

65. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants have not paid an additional hour of pay at the "regular rate of pay" to Plaintiffs and Class members at their respective regular rates of pay for each violation, per California Labor Code § 226.7.

66. As a result, Defendants are responsible for paying premium compensation for meal period violations, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit pursuant to the applicable Wage Orders, Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and Civil Code §§ 3287(b) and 3289.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTSS)

67. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

/ / /

68. Section 12 of the applicable Wage Orders and Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516 establish the right of non-exempt employees to be provided with a rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour period worked, or major fraction thereof.

69. Due to their unlawful rest period policy/practices and operational requirements/work demands, Defendants did not authorize and permit Plaintiffs and Class members to take all rest periods to which they were legally entitled.

70. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants have not paid an additional hour of pay at the "regular rate of pay" to Plaintiffs and Class members at their respective regular rates of pay for each violation, per California Labor Code § 226.7.

71. The foregoing violations create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiffs and members of the Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of rest period premiums owing, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit pursuant to the applicable Wage Orders, Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516, and Civil Code §§ 3287(b) and 3289.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY ALL SICK TIME

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTSS)

72. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

73. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, and 1199 which provide that "[a]n employee who, on or after July 1, 2015, 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. . . at the rate of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked, beginning at the commencement of employment."

74. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly pay Plaintiffs and Class members for all sick time pursuant to California Labor Code § 246 and the applicable Wage Orders.

75. Labor Code § 246(l)(1) provides that paid sick time for non-exempt employees must be "calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek."

Additionally, Labor Code § 246(l)(2) states that the paid sick time must be "calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment." Finally, Labor Code §246(i) requires employers to "provide an employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either the employee's itemized wage statement described in Section 226 or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee's payment of wages."

76. Defendants failed in their obligation to provide Plaintiffs and the Class the legally required paid sick days at the legal rate pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246(a), (b). Plaintiffs and the Class members were not paid at the correct "regular rate of pay."

77. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiffs and the members of the Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of wages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 246 1192, 1194 *et seq*., 1197, 1198, the applicable Wage Orders, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTSS)

78. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

79. Labor Code 226(a) states in pertinent part the following:

> "(a) An employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, shall furnish to his or her employee, either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement 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 his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly

rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee."

80. As set forth above, during the Class Period, Defendants issued and continue to issue wage statements to its employees, including Plaintiffs and members of the Wage Statement Subclass, which are inadequate under Labor Code Section § 226(a).

81. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the Wage Statement Subclass for all minimum, overtime and sick pay wages, and missed meal and rest period premiums at the appropriate legal rate, Defendants failed to include required information on Plaintiffs and the Wage Statement Subclass' wage statements, including, but not limited to, the gross wages earned, the net wages earned in violation of Labor Code section 226(a), (1,2,5, and 9).

82. Defendants' failure to comply with section 226(a) of the Labor Code was knowing and intentional.

83. As a result of Defendants' issuance of inaccurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiffs and members of the Wage Statement Subclass in violation of section 226(a) of the California Labor Code, Plaintiffs and members of the Wage Statement Subclass are each entitled to recover an initial penalty of $50, and subsequent penalties of $100, up to an amount not exceeding an aggregate penalty of $4,000 per Plaintiffs and per every member of the Wage Statement Subclass from Defendants' pursuant to section 226(e) of the Labor Code, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

WAITING TIME PENALTIES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTSS)

84. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

85. The actionable period for this cause of action is three years before the filing of this Complaint through the present and ongoing until the violation is corrected, or the class is certified.

86. Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 require Defendants to pay all compensation due and owing to Plaintiffs and the Waiting Time Subclass during the actionable period for this cause of action at or around the time their employment is terminated or ended.

87. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay compensation

promptly upon discharge or resignation, as required by Labor Code sections 201 and 202, the employer is liable for penalties for continued compensation up to thirty (30) workdays.

88. Defendants willfully failed to pay the Waiting Time Subclass for all hours worked, including all minimum and overtime wages, and their meal and rest period premiums at the "regular rate of pay" before or upon termination or separation from employment with Defendants as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

89. As a result, Defendants are liable to the Waiting Time Subclass for waiting time penalties amounting to thirty (30) days wages for Plaintiffs and the Waiting Time Subclass pursuant to Labor Code § 203. *See,* e.g., DLSE Manual, 4.3.4 (Failure to pay any sort of wages due upon termination entitles an employee to recover waiting time penalties).

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO REIMBURSE FOR NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENDITURES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTSS)

90. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

91. Labor Code 2802(a) states in pertinent part the following: "(a) An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful."

92. As set forth above, Plaintiffs and Class members must be compensated for all necessary business expenditures, including, but not limited to, a reasonable portion of their monthly personal cell phone bills incurred in the discharge of their duties. (See *Cochran v. Schwan's Home Service, Inc.* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1137 ("We hold that when employees must use their personal cell phones for work-related calls, Labor Code section 2802 requires the employer to reimburse them. Whether the employees have cell phone plans with unlimited minutes or limited minutes, the reimbursement owed is a reasonable percentage of their cell phone bills.").

93. At all relevant times, Defendants have failed to comply with Labor Code Section 2802 and the applicable Wage Orders by failing to reimburse Plaintiffs and the Class for all necessary

business expenditures.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR COMPETITION

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTSS)

94. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

95. Defendants have engaged and continues to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business practices in California in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq*., by failing to pay for all hours worked, by failing to pay all minimum, overtime and sick pay wages at the proper legal rate, by failing to provide all legally required meal and rest periods or pay premium payments at the "regular rate of pay" in lieu thereof, by failing to provide accurate wage statements, by failing to pay all earned wages at the time of separation from employment, and by failing to reimburse for all necessary business expenses adequately.

96. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived Plaintiffs and continues to deprive members of the Classes of compensation to which they are legally entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage over Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers and attempting to do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws.

97. Because Plaintiffs is a victim of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged herein, Plaintiffs, for themselves and on behalf of the members of the Classes, seeks full restitution of monies, as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17208.

98. The acts complained of herein occurred within the last four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint in this action.

99. Plaintiffs were compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to protect their interests and those of the Classes, to obtain restitution and injunctive relief on behalf of Defendants' current hourly non-exempt employees, and to enforce important rights affecting the public interest. Plaintiffs has thereby incurred the financial burden of attorneys' fees and costs, which they are entitled to recover under Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

100. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

101. Defendants have committed several Labor Code violations against Plaintiffs and other similarly aggrieved employees. Plaintiffs, as "aggrieved employees" within the meaning of Labor Code § 2698 *et seq*., acting on behalf of themselves and other similarly aggrieved employees, bring this PAGA representative action against Defendants to recover the civil penalties due to Plaintiffs, other similarly aggrieved employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 (a) and (f) including, but not limited to (1) $100 for each initial violation and (2) $200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided based on the following Labor Code violations:

a) Failing to pay Plaintiffs and similarly Aggrieve Employees for all minimum wages for all hours worked or for which they were subject to the control of the employer;

b) Failing to pay Plaintiffs and other similarly Aggrieved Employees all overtime and sick pay wages at the appropriate premium rates in violation of Labor Code §§ 246, 510, 1194, 1197;

c) Failing to provide Plaintiffs and other similarly Aggrieved Employees with all of their statutorily mandated meal periods in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194 and 1198;

d) Failing to authorize and permit Plaintiffs and other similarly Aggrieved employees with all of their statutorily mandated rest periods in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;

e) Failing to furnish Plaintiffs and other similarly situated employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage statements in violations of Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable Wage Orders;

f) Failing to pay final wages in a timely manner in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203 and applicable Wage Orders; and

g) Failing to reimburse Plaintiffs and other aggrieved employees with all necessary business expenditures in violation of Labor Code §§ 2802-2804 and applicable Wage Orders.

102. On or about August 25, 2026, Plaintiffs notified Defendants OPM Services, LLC, Coast Environmental Duct Cleaning, Inc., and Alliance Environmental Group, LLC (collectively,

"Defendants") and the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") via email of Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq*., with respect to violations of the California Labor Code identified in Paragraph 101 (a)-(g). Now that the sixty-five days have passed from Plaintiffs notifying Defendant of these violations, Plaintiffs have exhausted their administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act with respect to these violations.

103. Plaintiffs were compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to protect their interests and the interests of similarly aggrieved employees, and to assess and collect the civil penalties owed by Defendants. Plaintiff have hereby incurred attorneys' fees and costs, which they are entitled to receive under California Labor Code § 2699.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs prays for judgment for themselves and all others on whose behalf this suit is brought against Defendants, as follows:

1. For an order certifying the proposed Classes;

2. For an order appointing Plaintiffs as representative of the Classes;

3. For an order appointing Counsel for Plaintiffs as Counsel for the Classes;

4. Upon the First and Second Cause of Action for compensatory, consequential, general, and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198 and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;

5. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general, and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;

6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general, and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;

7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general, and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;

8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general, and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246, 558, 1194.2, 1198, and 1199;

9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226(a), and reasonable costs and attorneys' fees;

10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for statutory waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201-203;

11. Upon the Eighth Cause of Action, for unreimbursed expenses, interest, and attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2802;

12. Upon the Ninth Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiffs and members of the Classes of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or practices declared by this Court to be in violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq*.;

13. Upon the Tenth Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to Plaintiffs, other similarly Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 (a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) $100.00 for each initial violation and $200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided under the Labor Code, and for reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;

14. Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to California Labor Code § 218.6 and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289;

15. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code §§ 218.5, 226, 1194, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

16. For such other relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: October 29, 2026

FALAKASSA LAW, P.C.
BOKHOUR LAW GROUP, P.C.

By: _____

Joshua Falakassa, Esq.
Mehrdad Bokhour, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Putative Classes