Electronically Filed by Superior Court of California, County of Orange, 10/29/2026 01:54:00 PM.
30-2026-01595681-CU-OE-CXC - ROA # 11 - DAVID H. YAMASAKI, Clerk of the Court By B. Sanchez, Deputy Clerk.

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.
William C. Sung, SB# 280792
E-Mail: william@justiceforworkers.com
Tiffany L. Luu SB# 335127
E-Mail: tluu@justiceforworkers.com
Joseph C. Ramli, SB# 339491
E-Mail: jramli@justiceforworkers.com
Guneez Ibrahim, SB# 367321
E-Mail: gibrahim@justiceforworkers.com
9575 Bolsa Avenue
Westminster, CA 92683
Tel: 323-922-2000
Fax: 323-922-2000

Attorneys for Plaintiffs HEATHER LE and HONG KIM TRAN

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

HEATHER LE and HONG KIM TRAN, individuals and on behalf of all others similarly situated;

Plaintiffs,

vs.

APPLIED MANUFACTURING LLC, a California limited liability company; APPLIED MEDICAL RESOURCES CORPORATION, a California corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,

Defendants.

Case No.: 30-2026-01595681-CU-OE-CXC

FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT:

(1) MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS (LABOR CODE §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197);

(2) OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS (LABOR CODE §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1198);

(3) MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS (LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512, 558);

(4) REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS (LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 516, 558);

(5) WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES (LABOR CODE § 226);

(6) WAITING TIME PENALTIES (LABOR CODE §§ 201-203);

(7) UNFAIR COMPETITION (BUS & PROF CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*); and

(8) CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE CALIFORNIA PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT (LABOR CODE §§ 2698, *et seq.*)

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs HEATHER LE and HONG KIM TRAN ("Plaintiffs"), on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, hereby bring this First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint ("Complaint") against Defendants APPLIED MANUFACTURING LLC, a California limited liability company, APPLIED MEDICAL RESOURCES CORPORATION, a California corporation, and DOES 1 to 50 (collectively "Defendants"), and on information and belief allege as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, hereby bring this Complaint for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 2698, *et seq*., and Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order 1-2001 ("Wage Order 1"), in addition to seeking injunctive relief, declaratory relief, and restitution. This Complaint is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants' violations of the Labor Code because the amount in controversy exceeds $25,000.

2. Venue is proper in this judicial district because Defendants maintain offices, have agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, including Orange County, and some of the acts and omissions complained of herein occurred in Orange County. Furthermore, Plaintiffs were employed by Defendants within Orange County.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiffs are, and at all times relevant herein were, individuals over the age of eighteen (18) and are California residents. Within the statute of limitations periods applicable to each cause of action pled herein, Plaintiffs were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees. Plaintiffs were, and are, victims of Defendants' policies, practices, and/or customs complained of herein and have been deprived of the rights guaranteed by Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 2698, *et seq.*, and Wage Order 1.

/ / /

4. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that during the applicable statute of limitations for each cause of action pled herein and continuing to the present, Defendants engaged in, and continue to engage in, business, and employed Plaintiffs and other, similarly-situated non-exempt employees within Orange County, and the State of California and, therefore, were (and are) doing business in Orange County and the State of California.

5. 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 based thereon allege, 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 (as defined below) to be subject to the unlawful employment practices, wrongs, injuries, and damages complained of herein.

6. 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; and furthermore, Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each 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.

7. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that at all times material hereto, each of the Defendants named herein was the agent, employee, alter ego and/or joint venturer of, or working in concert with each of the other co-Defendants and was acting within the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity. To the extent said acts, conduct, and omissions were perpetrated by certain Defendants, each of the remaining Defendants confirmed and ratified said acts, conduct, and omissions of the acting Defendants.

8. At all times herein mentioned, 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.

/ / /

9. At all times herein mentioned, the acts and omissions of various Defendants, and each of them, concurred and contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and all of the other Defendants in proximately causing the injuries and damages as herein alleged.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

10. Defendants own and operate a medical device manufacturing company in Rancho Santa Margarita, California. Defendants employed Plaintiff Heather Le as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately July 2013 to approximately March 2026 as a Quality Control Team Leader. Defendants employed Plaintiff Hong Kim Tran as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately August 2022 to present as an Assembler.

11. Throughout Plaintiffs' employment with Defendants, Defendants' timekeeping and/or payroll policies and practices resulted in Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees not being compensated for all hours actually worked. Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees regularly worked more than eight hours in a workday or 40 hours in a workweek. Upon information and belief, at times, Defendants required Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees to perform work before their scheduled shifts, after their scheduled shifts, and/or during off-the-clock meal breaks, and failed to compensate employees for this time. Upon information and belief, Defendants also failed to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration into the regular rate of pay. As a result, Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees were not compensated for all earned minimum and overtime wages.

12. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees with all legally compliant meal periods due to Defendants' meal period policies/practices, which resulted in late (commencing after the fifth hour of work), short (less than 30 minutes), and/or missed meal periods. Upon information and belief, at times, Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees were not able to take their legally compliant meal breaks due to work demands imposed by Defendants. Upon information and belief, Defendants do not keep accurate records of Plaintiffs' and other non-exempt employees' hours worked, including accurate time records showing when employees take their meal periods. On those occasions when Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees were not provided with all legally compliant meal periods to which they were entitled, Defendants failed to

compensate Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees with the required meal period premium(s) for each workday there was a meal period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon information and belief, Defendants violated Labor Code § 226.7 by failing to pay meal period premiums at the correct regular rate of compensation by incorporating all non-discretionary incentive compensation in the event that a legally compliant meal period was not provided to their non-exempt employees.

13. At times, Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees were not authorized and permitted to take all required rest periods due to Defendants' unlawful rest period policies/practices, which failed to authorize and permit a net 10-minute rest period for every four hours worked, or major fraction thereof. On occasion, Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees were not able to take their legally compliant rest breaks due to work demands imposed by Defendants. On those occasions when Plaintiffs and other non-exempt employees were not authorized and permitted to take all legally compliant rest periods to which they were entitled, Defendants failed to compensate them with the required rest period premium(s) for each workday there was a rest period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon information and belief, Defendants maintained no mechanism for the payment of rest period premium payments as required by Labor Code § 226.7, in the event that a legally compliant rest period was not authorized and permitted to their non-exempt employees.

14. Additionally, upon information and belief, Defendants violated Labor Code § 246 by failing to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration into the paid sick leave pay rate.

15. During the relevant time period, Defendants did not provide Plaintiffs and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to accurately state the total hours worked, the correct gross and net wages earned for all time worked, the correct name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, the correct inclusive dates of the pay period, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

16. As a further result of Defendants' failure to pay all minimum and overtime wages, sick leave wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, Defendants failed to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiffs and other former non-exempt employees upon their separation of employment from Defendants.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

17. **Class Definitions**: Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and the following Classes pursuant to § 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure:

a. Minimum Wage Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who were subject to Defendants' timekeeping and payroll policies and/or practices, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.

b. Overtime Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who worked more than eight hours per day and/or 40 hours per week and were subject to Defendants' timekeeping policies and/or practices, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.

c. Meal Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who: (i) worked at least one shift in excess of 5.0 hours; and/or (ii) worked at least one shift in excess of 10.0 hours, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.

d. Rest Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who worked at least one shift of 3.5 or more hours, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.

e. Wage Statement Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who received a wage statement, during the one year immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.

f. Waiting Time Penalty Class: All of Defendants' formerly employed members of the Minimum Wage Class, Overtime Class, Rest Period Class, and/or Meal Period Class during the three years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the

present.

18. **Numerosity/Ascertainability**: The members of the Classes are so numerous that joinder of all members would be impractical, if not impossible. The membership of the Classes is unknown to Plaintiffs at this time; however, it is estimated that the members of the Classes number greater than 50 individuals. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants' employment records, including payroll records.

19. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well-Defined Community of Interest**: There are predominant common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiffs and members of the Classes, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members including, without limitation to:

a. Whether Defendants properly paid all overtime wages to members of the Overtime Class;

b. Whether Defendants paid at least the minimum wage for all hours worked to members of the Minimum Wage Class;

c. Whether Defendants provided all legally compliant meal periods or paid meal period premium wages due to members of the Meal Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;

d. Whether Defendants authorized and permitted all legally compliant rest periods or paid all rest period premium wages due to members of the Rest Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;

e. Whether Defendants furnished legally compliant wage statements to members of the Wage Statement Class pursuant to Labor Code § 226; and

f. Whether Defendants timely paid all final wages to members of the Waiting Time Class at the time of their separation of employment pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

These common questions of law and fact set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendants' policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member. As such, the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual

class member's showing as to their eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of their damages.

20. **Typicality**: The claims of Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Classes because Plaintiffs were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees in California during the statute(s) of limitations period applicable to each cause of action pled in the Complaint. As alleged herein, Plaintiffs, like the members of the Classes, were not paid all minimum and overtime wages owed due to Defendants' timekeeping and payroll policies/practices, not provided all required meal periods, not authorized and permitted all rest periods, did not receive premium pay for non-compliant meal and rest periods, not paid all final wages upon separation of employment, and not provided with accurate, compliant, itemized wage statements.

21. **Adequacy of Representation**: Plaintiffs are 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 and Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs' attorneys have litigated numerous wage-and-hour class actions in state and federal courts in the past and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the members of the Classes.

22. **Superiority**: The 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 would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources.

23. Moreover, requiring each member of the Class(es) 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. 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 hereto.

24. Furthermore, 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. As such, the Classes identified hereinabove are maintainable as classes under § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS

(Against All Defendants)

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

26. Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1197, and Wage Order 1, § 4 establish the right of employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state or local 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. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to conform its pay practices to the requirements of the law by failing to pay Plaintiffs and members of the Minimum Wage Class for all hours worked, including, but not limited to, all hours they were subject to the control of Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the Labor Code and Wage Order 1.

27. Labor Code § 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an employee under conditions that the IWC prohibits. California 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.

28. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of minimum wages, Plaintiffs and members of the Minimum Wage Class seek recovery of the balance of unpaid wages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 218.6, 558, 1194, 1194.2, and 1199, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS

(Against All Defendants)

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

30. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1198, and Wage Order 1, § 3, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to all overtime wages and compensation for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

31. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly compensate non-exempt employees, including Plaintiffs and members of the Overtime Class, for all overtime hours worked pursuant to Labor Code § 1194 and Wage Order 1. Wage Order 1, § 3 requires an employer to pay an employee one and one-half (1½) times and two times the employee's regular rate of pay for overtime and double time hours work. Defendants caused Plaintiffs and members of the Overtime Class to work overtime hours but failed to compensate these employees for all overtime hours actually worked.

32. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of overtime wages, Plaintiffs and members of the Overtime Class seek recovery of the balance of unpaid overtime wages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 216, 218.6, 510, 1194, and 1198; Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and Civil Code §§

3287 and 3289.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS

(Against All Defendants)

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

34. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to provide all of their non-exempt employees in California, including Plaintiffs and members of the Meal Period Class, with all legally compliant meal periods in accordance with the mandates of the Labor Code and Wage Order 1, § 11.

35. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants did not pay an additional hour of pay to Plaintiffs and members of the Meal Period Class at their respective regular rates of compensation, in accordance with California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226.7, and 512.

36. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful meal period practices, Plaintiffs and members of the Meal Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for meal period violations including attorney's fees, interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 218.5, 226.7, 512, 558, Wage Order 1, and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS

(Against All Defendants)

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

38. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and Wage Order 1, § 12 and establish the right of employees to be provided with a rest period of at least 10 minutes for each four-hour period worked, or major fraction thereof. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that despite Defendants' failure to authorize and permit Plaintiffs and members of the Rest Period Class to take all legally compliant rest periods as alleged herein, Defendants did not pay these individuals an additional hour of pay at their respective regular rate for the rest periods that they failed to

authorize and permit them to take, as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

39. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful rest period practices, Plaintiffs and members of the Rest Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for rest period violations including attorney's fees, interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 218.5, 226.7, 516, 558, Wage Order 1, and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES

(Against All Defendants)

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

41. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants knowingly and intentionally, as a matter of uniform policy and practice, failed to furnish Plaintiffs and members of the Wage Statement Class with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements that included, among other requirements, all hours worked, total gross wages earned, all rates of pay and corresponding number of hours worked, total net wages earned, the inclusive dates of the pay period, and/or the correct name and address of the legal entity that is the employer in violation of Labor Code § 226.

42. Defendants' failure to furnish Plaintiffs and members of the Wage Statement Class with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements resulted in actual injury, as said failures led to, among other things, the non-payment of minimum and overtime wages, sick leave, and meal and rest period premium wages owed and deprived them of the information necessary to identify the discrepancies in Defendants' reported payroll data.

43. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful wage statement practices, Plaintiffs and members of the Wage Statement Class seek damages and/or statutory penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code § 226.

/ / /

/ / /

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

WAITING TIME PENALTIES

(Against All Defendants)

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

45. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201-203, which require an employer to pay all wages immediately at the time of separation of employment in the event the employer discharges the employee or the employee provides at least 72 hours of notice of their intent to quit. In the event the employee provides less than 72 hours of notice of their intent to quit, said employee's wages become due and payable not later than 72 hours upon said employee's last date of employment.

46. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants failed to timely pay Plaintiffs and members of the Waiting Time Class all final wages due to them at their separation from employment, including unpaid minimum and overtime wages, sick leave as well as unpaid meal and rest period premium wages.

47. Furthermore, Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that as a matter of uniform policy and practice, Defendants continue to fail to pay Plaintiffs and members of the Waiting Time Class all earned wages at the end of employment in a timely manner pursuant to the requirements of Labor Code §§ 201-202.

48. Defendants' failure to pay all final wages was willful within the meaning of Labor Code § 203. Defendants' willful failure to timely pay Plaintiffs and the members of the Waiting Time Class their earned wages upon separation from employment results in continued payment of daily wages up to thirty days from the time the wages were due.

49. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful practices, Plaintiffs and members of the Waiting Time Class seek statutory penalties, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code § 203.

/ / /

/ / /

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR COMPETITION

(Against All Defendants)

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

51. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business practices in California in violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, by:

a. failing to pay Plaintiffs and members of the Minimum Wage Class all minimum wages due;

b. failing to pay Plaintiffs and members of the Overtime Class all overtime wages due;

c. failing to provide Plaintiffs and members of the Meal Period Class with all meal periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all meal period premium wages due;

d. failing to authorize and permit Plaintiffs and members of the Rest Period Class all rest periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all rest period premium wages due;

e. failing to issue accurate and itemized wage statements to Plaintiffs and members of the Wage Statement Class; and

f. failing to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiffs and members of the Waiting Time Penalty Class.

52. 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.

53. Because Plaintiffs are victims of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged herein, Plaintiffs for themselves and on behalf of the members of the Classes, seek 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.

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

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT

(Against All Defendants)

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

56. Plaintiffs, "aggrieved employees" within the meaning of Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*, acting on behalf of themselves and other aggrieved employees (collectively, "Aggrieved Employees"), bring this representative action against Defendants to recover the civil penalties due to Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) $100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to pay each employee and $200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210 and/or 225.5 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) $50.00 for each initial violation and $100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) $100 for each initial violation and $250 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per employee per pay period; (4) $250 for each initial violation and $1,000 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to Labor Code § 256, a civil penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as waiting time under the terms of Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) $100 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, based on the following Labor Code violations:

a. Failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked to Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code § 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198;

/ / /

b. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned overtime compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;

c. Failing to provide all legally required meal periods, and failure to pay meal period premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, and 1198;

d. Failing to authorize and permit all legally required rest periods, and failure to pay rest period premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198;

e. Failing to furnish Aggrieved Employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226;

f. Failing to timely pay all final wages and compensation earned by Aggrieved Employees at the time of separation in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-202;

g. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all paid sick leave wages in violation of Labor Code § 246;

h. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned wages at least twice during each calendar month in violation of Labor Code § 204; and

i. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1198.

57. On or about September 1, 2026 and October 2, 2026, Plaintiffs notified Defendants via certified mail, and notified the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") via its website, of Defendants' violations of the Labor Code and Plaintiffs' intent to bring a claim for civil penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* with respect to the violations of the Labor Code identified in the preceding paragraph. Now that 33 days and 65 days have passed from Plaintiffs notifying Defendants and the LWDA of these violations, Defendants have not cured any curable violations, and the LWDA has not provided notice that it intends to investigate the violations, Plaintiffs have exhausted administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act with respect to these violations.

/ / /

58. Plaintiffs have incurred attorneys' fees and costs, which Plaintiffs are entitled to receive under California Labor Code § 2699(g).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment for themselves and for 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 representatives of the Classes;

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

4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for payment of minimum wages, liquidated damages, and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197;

5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for payment of overtime wages and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;

6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for meal period premium wages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558;

7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for rest period premium wages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558;

8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226;

9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203;

10. Upon the Seventh 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.;

11. Upon the Eighth Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to Plaintiffs, other Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) $100.00 for each initial violation for each

failure to pay each employee and $200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210 and/or 225.5 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) $50.00 for each initial violation and $100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) $100.00 for each initial violation and $250.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per employee per pay period; (4) $250.00 for each initial violation and $1,000.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to Labor Code § 256, a civil penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as waiting time under the terms of Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) $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;

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

13. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code §§ 218.5, 226, 1194, 2699(g), and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

14. For such other and further relief, the Court may deem just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury on all claims.

DATED: October 29, 2026

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.

By: _____

William C. Sung
Tiffany L. Luu
Joseph C. Ramli
Guneez Ibrahim
Attorneys for Plaintiffs
HEATHER LE and HONG KIM TRAN